

H. Robert Nelson to be postmaster at Wilkeson, Wash., in place of H. R. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1930.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Henry N. Murphy to be postmaster at Anawalt, W. Va., in place of H. N. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

Hattie Brown to be postmaster at Bramwell, W. Va., in place of Hattie Brown. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

Harper B. Kinzer to be postmaster at Ethel, W. Va., in place of L. E. Winston, resigned.

Mary E. Hill to be postmaster at Mabscott, W. Va., in place of J. P. Peck. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Raymond Walls to be postmaster at Man, W. Va., in place of J. M. Stratton, removed.

Easter Y. Shafer to be postmaster at Rupert, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1929.

Jesse H. Miller to be postmaster at Switchback, W. Va., in place of J. C. Turley, resigned.

## WISCONSIN

Victor F. Platta to be postmaster at Hatley, Wis., in place of V. F. Platta. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Frank E. Munroe to be postmaster at Ladysmith, Wis., in place of F. E. Munroe. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1930.

Carl C. Corbett to be postmaster at Plymouth, Wis., in place of A. W. Wiggin, removed.

John H. Zahrt to be postmaster at Sparta, Wis., in place of J. H. Zahrt. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

## WYOMING

Charles A. Ackenhausen to be postmaster at Worland, Wyo., in place of C. A. Ackenhausen. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1930.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, April 11, 1930

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. TILSON].

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinitely Holy Father, we ask Thee to maintain Thy covenant with us, that by Thy gentleness and sweet attractions we may be drawn more and more to Thee. Thou art not only a God of wisdom and a God of might, for we discern Thee in the wonders of our deepest loves, in the beauty and glory of Thy all-abounding mercy and goodness. Over against every yearning, over against every temptation, over against every fear, over against every affliction is Thy beloved Son, meeting every want and supplying every need. May the memory of Him who took little children in His arms and put His holy hands upon their heads and blessed them, direct and encourage us until the latest year of our earthly lives. Do Thou inspire our faith in the glorified cross of the Saviour of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10865. An act to authorize Brig. Gen. William S. Thayer, Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, and Brig. Gen. William H. Welch, Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, to accept the awards of the French Legion of Honor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6564. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8531. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Wednesday the 16th, which would be the Calendar Wednesday of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, be exchanged to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, by agreement with that committee, which would have the 23d, and that the latter committee, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, have the 16th, and that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have the 23d.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Committees on Rivers and Harbors and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, by agreement between themselves, may exchange the next two Calendar Wednesday days so that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee may have Wednesday the 16th and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors the 23d. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would be glad if some one from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries would give us information as to what will be brought up on that Wednesday, particularly with reference to the construction program bill which was passed in the last Congress and vetoed by the President. Is that bill to be brought up on that Wednesday?

Mr. LEHLBACH. What is that bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. The fish cultural station bill.

Mr. LEHLBACH. No; that will not be brought up. It is purposed to bring up a bill amending in certain administrative particulars the radio act and possibly a bill permitting the Government to dispose of certain property in the form of piers to which it now holds title.

Mr. CRAMTON. My only interest was in the bill I mentioned.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I might say further that this interchange does not in any way inconvenience the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, but will materially assist in the orderly presentation of the business of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Without seeking to bind the committee, does the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries intend to bring up any bill amending or changing the merchant marine act of 1928 and amendments thereof?

Mr. LEHLBACH. No; only in so far as the disposal of certain terminals is concerned.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But not ships?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Not ships.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York the object of transferring from the 16th to the 23d?

Mr. DEMPSEY. While we have the consideration of the bill practically completed, it would be almost impossible, if not quite impossible, to be ready for next Wednesday, but we will be ready for the succeeding Wednesday.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman and myself have had a number of conversations about the passage of a rivers and harbors bill. I have been told for the last two months that within a week this bill would be ready; that within a week it certainly would be ready; it would be ready not later than the 15th, and the other day I queried the gentleman from New York, and he said it would be reported not later than next Monday. What is the reason for the delay? Is it for the purpose of defeating this legislation?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No. The reason is just this: There has been no rivers and harbors bill for three years. We have been obliged to consider something over 100 projects, many of them involving highly controversial questions which required a very great deal of time, both in the committee and by the chairman personally outside of the committee. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that the chairman of the committee has been working literally pretty nearly night and day and Sundays.

Mr. GARNER. I take it, the chairman has been working outside of the committee room?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me tell the gentleman. There are in this bill some items that required very prolonged and very delicate handling in order to insure our having a rivers and harbors bill, and instead of the delay threatening the passage of the bill, the delay, I believe, will insure practically, if not entirely, complete harmony in the consideration of the bill before the House. I can not see myself where we are going to

have any real contest or real objection to the bill. I think that the gentlemen who believed they had highly controversial questions have been entirely satisfied, and I think that is going to be true of every important question in the bill.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman will yield further, the President of the United States urged waterways as one of the principal things he wanted to have accomplished by this Congress. He not only urged it in his message but in his speeches prior to the election and after the election. Now we are reaching the latter part of the session, and the gentleman's committee has not yet been able to report a bill. There are rumors to the effect that when this bill is reported it will pass the House of Representatives. As the gentleman knows, he could have brought the bill up two months ago if he had wanted to do so. I understand that when the bill goes to the other end of the Capitol that certain Senators, on account of possible legislation in the bill, will undertake to defeat it, if necessary, by filibustering. What does the gentleman know about that?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I was advised of the rumor which the gentleman mentioned and I was also told yesterday in what I regard as a perfectly dependable and wholly reliable way that all of that rumor of filibuster had disappeared.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman has been conferring with the President of the United States?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And the President of the United States, if I understand it, desires a rivers and harbors bill passed at this session?

Mr. DEMPSEY. He is very earnest for it.

Mr. GARNER. Is that correct?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is correct.

Mr. GARNER. And the gentleman is going to bring the bill in on the 23d?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. For the purpose of passing it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. We expect to pass it; yes.

Mr. GARNER. And there will be no question about it next Wednesday week.

Mr. DEMPSEY. None at all.

Mr. GARNER. I queried the gentleman about the matter last week and he assured me that he would have it ready on Monday and the bill would be considered on Wednesday, and in view of the several conversations we have had I would like to have it just as specific as the English language can possibly make it that we will consider it on the 23d.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me say in answer to the gentleman that the committee has been most diligent. It has not been through any lack of work, through any lack of effort, or through any lack of desire; it has simply been because we have met with obstacles, and the chairman has met with obstacles outside of the committee room, and it was necessary in the interest of the speedy and the practically unanimous passage of the bill to dispose of that.

I will also say to the gentleman I believe every one of them of any consequence has been adjusted, and I do not think there will be anything to what the gentleman has heard by way of rumor with respect to action in the other body. I think the bill will pass there just as readily and by just as big a vote as it will here.

Mr. GARNER. I hope that statement is correct.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me ask the gentleman this question: If this unanimous-consent request is granted by the House to-day, is there any way by which any question could arise whereby we would be prevented from presenting this bill to the House on the 23d?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not know of any.

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course, the question of consideration can always be raised. You would be in the same position then as you would be on the 16th.

Mr. STAFFORD. And also, I may say, Mr. Speaker, there could be raised the question of whether it is privileged under the rules to be considered on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I could not hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] when he was under the grueling cross-examination by the gentleman from Texas. Just what is it that has delayed the presenting of this epoch making bill that the gentleman is going to bring in?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Well, two things. The situation is somewhat the same as the one with respect to the committee of the gentleman from Texas, the Ways and Means Committee. They had the tariff bill and they had about six months before we convened to consider it. When we came back here, we had not had a rivers and harbors bill for three years, when ordinarily we have one each year. We ought to have one each year, but owing to peculiar circumstances we had not had one

for three years. The result was the accumulation of an enormous number of projects, many of them long projects. For instance, we had one report of between 800 and 900 printed pages. We had many reports of great length, and in order to deal fairly with the projects and at the same time be assured that the interests of the Government were protected it was necessary to carefully consider these projects.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I understand that, but may I ask the gentleman, without intending to be offensive and in all kindness, is there any trading going on just now?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Trading is not possible. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6564) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, ask for a conference, and appoint conferees; and in presenting this request, I may say I have discussed the matter with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], and this request is agreeable to him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6564, the Interior Department appropriation bill, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and announces the following conferees: Messrs. CRAMTON, MURPHY, and TAYLOR of Colorado.

#### MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation be authorized some time next week to hold an evening session of the committee to take testimony concerning certain medical subjects.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose of the request?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Simply to have a hearing.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman mean while the House is in session?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the Chair whether this request is necessary unless the House should happen to be in session that evening, which is not likely to occur?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It does not seem to the Chair necessary unless the House should be in session.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman is seeking our approval, he can be assured of that.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The House might be in session at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

#### PROBABLE COST OF THE DEBENTURE SYSTEM

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter and tables prepared by the Tariff Commission giving an estimate of the probable cost of the debenture system as outlined in identical bills presented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] and myself, prepared in cooperation with the master of the National Grange.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated by him. Is there objection?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Reserving the right to object, a table was placed in the RECORD showing the benefit to different agricultural commodities and also burdens on the Treasury on March 13 last by myself. Are the tables the gentleman wants to insert the same that were inserted by me?

Mr. JONES of Texas. They are not the same tables, but are prepared on the same basis. The gentleman's proposal covered all commodities that could be possibly classed as agricultural, and did not apply to any bill ever presented in either body.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Oh, yes; there was such a bill in the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Texas. No; the bill pending in the Senate, the Norris amendment leaves it optional and discretionary with the Farm Board to place a debenture on any agricultural commodities.



Mr. RAMSEYER. The Norris amendment is in the tariff bill. I had reference to another bill in the Senate which would make it mandatory on all agricultural products.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The Senate never took any favorable action on that bill, and it was introduced by an individual Senator.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is true, and there was also a bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM], which differed from the Norris plan.

Mr. JONES of Texas. It differs in this, that it uses practically the same basis but sets out specific schedules. The gentleman understands that in the ordinary classification under our tariff system a great many commodities are classified as agricultural that are not strictly in that class, and ought not to be so classed in any plan to relieve agriculture. This table sets out specific articles as natural agricultural commodities. The bills prepared by Mr. KETCHAM and myself also give authority to include other farm commodities in the event of an emergency, which might increase the cost somewhat. But this table includes all of the mandatory schedules.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I have no objection; but I shall examine with interest the tables the gentleman inserts.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I think the gentleman may do so with profit; at least, I hope he finds them informative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter and tables prepared by the Tariff Commission giving an estimate of the probable cost of the debenture system.

The matter is as follows:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,  
Washington, April 9, 1930.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JONES: In accordance with your verbal request of April 4 to Mr. Lewis, we are sending the inclosed tabulations of estimates of debentures payable under H. R. 2667.

The tables are identical with those sent you April 4, except that the calculations are made on the basis of exports during the calendar year 1929 rather than on the basis of the 5-year average annual exports during the period 1925-1929.

You will note that the grand total of the estimated debentures payable under the bill as calculated on the basis of exports during 1929 amounts to \$137,000,000, as compared with \$141,000,000 on the basis of exports during the 5-year period 1925-1929.

Sincerely yours,

E. B. BROSSARD, Chairman.

A.—Debentures payable under section 7 (a), H. R. 12893, calculated on the basis of exports during the calendar year 1929

Commodity	Unit	Paragraph No.	Debenture rate	Quantity of exports, 1929	Debenture costs	Notes
Hogs	Number	1	¾ cent per pound	27,017	\$16,886	On assumption of average weight of 250 pounds per head.
Pork:						
Fresh	Pound	1	¾ cent per pound	13,539,070	50,772	
Wiltshire sides, shoulder sides, and hams	do	1	1 cent per pound	5,039,034	50,390	
Hams and shoulders, cured	do	1	do	125,796,825	1,257,968	
Bacon	do	1	do	138,423,370	1,384,234	
Cumberland sides	do	1	do	5,858,054	58,581	
Pickled	do	1	do	44,787,116	447,871	
Canned	do	1	do	10,239,914	102,399	
Sausage, not canned	do	1	do	3,724,042	37,240	
Sausage, canned	do	1	do	2,139,100	21,391	
Lard	do	1	½ cent per pound	847,867,918	4,239,340	
Cattle:						
Breeding bulls	Number	2	¾ cent per pound	2,196	13,176	Assuming 800 pounds per head.
Breeding cows	do	2	1 cent per pound	1,376	16,512	Assuming 1,200 pounds per head.
Other cattle	do	2	¾ cent per pound	3,937	14,764	Assuming 500 pounds per head.
Beef and veal, fresh	Pound	2	1½ cents per pound	2,917,859	43,768	
Corn	Bushel	3	7½ cents per bushel of 56 pounds	33,745,270	2,530,895	
Corn meal	Barrel	3	15 cents per 100 pounds	267,121	78,534	Assuming 196 pounds per barrel.
Hominy and corn grits	Pound	3	do	14,353,857	21,576	
Corn starch and corn flour	do	3	do	235,041,590	352,562	
Rice	do	4	¾ cent per pound	315,441,412	1,577,207	
Rice flour, meal, and broken rice	do	4	¾ cent per pound	70,593,595	176,484	
Wheat	Bushel	5	21 cents per bushel of 60 pounds	90,129,600	18,927,216	
Wheat flour	Barrel	5	52 cents per 100 pounds	13,663,457	13,925,795	Do.
Total of items other than cotton and tobacco					45,345,561	
Cotton, unmanufactured	Pound	6	2 cents per pound	3,481,509,485	69,630,190	
Leaf tobacco	do	7	do	555,415,451	11,108,309	
Grand total					126,084,060	

B.—Debentures payable under section 7 (c) (1), H. R. 12893, calculated on the basis of exports during the calendar year 1929, at debenture rates equal to one-half the duties in H. R. 2667 as passed by the House

Commodity	Unit	Par. No., House bill 2667	Tariff classification of commodity, one-half the duty on which is used as the debenture rate.	Tariff rate	Quantity or value of exports, 1929	Debenture cost
Wheat:						
Biscuits and crackers—						
Plain		733	Biscuits, etc.	30 per cent ad valorem	\$1,114,887	\$167,233
Sweetened		733	do	do	\$916,221	137,433
Macaroni, etc.	Pound	725	Macaroni, etc., containing no eggs	2 cents per pound	10,740,479	107,405
Breakfast foods—						
Ready to eat		732	Cereal breakfast foods	20 per cent ad valorem	\$181,511	18,151
To be cooked		732	do	do	\$140,740	14,074
Corn:						
Breakfast foods ready to eat		732	do	do	\$525,341	52,534
Corn oil		54	Oils, n. s. p. f.	do	\$42,329	4,233
Glucose (corn sirup)	Pound	503	Dextrose	2 cents per pound	118,523,086	1,185,231
Grape sugar (corn sugar)	do	503	do	do	7,238,983	72,390
Swine:						
Lard compounds containing animal fats	do	703	Lard compounds and lard substitutes	5 cents per pound	3,632,219	90,805
Cattle:						
Beef and veal, pickled or cured	do	706	Meats, preserved	6 cents per pound but not less than 20 per cent.	10,824,870	324,746
Beef, canned	do	706	do	do	\$1,321,002	
Oleo oil	do	701	Oleo oil	1 cent per pound	2,606,162	26,062
Oleo stock	do	701	Tallow	¼ cent per pound	\$945,462	341,044
Tallow	do	701	Tallow	do	68,208,850	20,238
Oleo and lard stearin	do	701	Oleo oil	1 cent per pound	8,095,202	9,600
Oleomargarine of animal and vegetable fats	do	709	Oleomargarine	14 cents per pound	3,840,020	19,653
Meat extracts and bouillon cubes	do	705	Extract of meat, including fluid	15 cents per pound	901,625	63,114
Gelatin	do	42	Edible gelatin, valued at 40 cents or more per pound.	20 per cent and 7 cents per pound.	185,115	13,584
					299,629	26,305
Total					\$168,696	2,762,620

<sup>1</sup> Specific rate used.

<sup>2</sup> Ad valorem rate used.

C.—Debentures payable under section 7 (c) (2), H. R. 12893, calculated on the basis of equivalent exports of raw cotton or leaf tobacco at the raw cotton or leaf tobacco debenture rates

Commodity	Unit	Debenture rate	Conversion factor	Quantity or value of exports, 1929	Equivalent exports of raw materials	Debenture costs
<b>(1) COTTON PRODUCTS</b>						
Cotton mill waste	Pound	2 cents per pound	1.1	59,129,559	65,042,515	\$1,300,850
Cotton rags, except paper stock	do	do	1.18	21,085,634	24,892,848	497,857
Cotton batting, carded cotton, and roving	do	do	1.05	446,301	468,616	9,372
Cotton yarn:						
Carded yarns, not combed	do	do	1.18	13,919,250	16,424,715	328,494
Combed yarns	do	do	1.43	13,571,962	19,407,906	388,158
Cotton thread and cordage:						
Sewing thread	do	do	1.43	1,053,882	1,507,051	30,141
Crochet, darning, and embroidery cotton	do	do	1.43	82,825	118,440	2,369
Twine and cordage	do	do	1.18	4,588,069	5,413,921	108,278
Cotton cloth, duck, and tire fabric:						
Tire fabric—						
Cord	Square yard	do	1.25	4,969,963	6,212,454	124,249
Other	do	do	1.25	1,355,239	1,694,049	33,881
Cotton duck—						
Heavy filter paper, dryer hose, and belting duck	do	do	2.36	688,618	1,625,138	32,503
Unbleached, ounce and number	do	do	1.18	10,294,888	12,147,968	242,959
Bleached	do	do	1.18	2,293,417	2,706,232	54,125
Colored	do	do	1.18	1,842,948	2,174,679	43,494
Cotton cloth, unbleached	do	do	0.34	137,836,942	47,127,841	942,557
Cotton cloth, bleached	do	do	0.25	89,303,349	22,604,385	452,087
Cotton cloth, colored	do	do	0.27	233,370,528	62,216,396	1,244,327
All other piece-dyed fabrics	do	do	0.21	43,918,973	9,441,527	188,831
All other yarn-dyed fabrics	do	do	0.22	19,807,137	4,357,570	87,151
Cotton and rayon mixtures (chief value cotton)	do	do	0.22	18,766,787	4,128,693	82,574
Other cotton fabrics:						
Blankets	Pound	do	1.25	1,569,156	1,961,445	39,229
Damasks	Square yard	do	0.37	780,072	288,627	5,773
Pile fabrics, plushes, velveteen, corduroys	do	do	0.74	494,061	365,605	7,312
Tapestry and other upholstery goods	do	do	1.00	293,125	293,125	5,862
Cotton fabrics sold by the pound	Pound	do	1.17	10,129,620	11,851,655	237,033
Cotton wearing apparel:						
Knit goods—						
Gloves	Dozen pairs	do	1.20	125,563	150,676	3,014
Hosiery	do	do	1.63	3,777,534	6,148,867	122,977
Underwear	Dozen	do	12	610,616	7,327,392	146,548
Sweaters, shawls, and other knit outerwear	Number	do	1.50	504,912	757,368	15,147
Other wearing apparel—						
Collars and cuffs	Dozen	do	(1)	231,206		
Cotton overalls, breeches, and pants	do	do	(1)	53,965		
Underwear, not knit	do	do	(1)	116,511		
Shirts	do	do	8	236,450	1,891,600	37,832
Dresses, skirts, and waists	do	do	\$1.50 per pound	\$596,117	397,451	7,949
Other cotton clothing	do	do	\$1.25 per pound	\$1,310,938	1,048,750	20,975
Other cotton manufactures—						
Handkerchiefs	Dozen	do	75 per cent men's, 0.14; 25 per cent women's, 0.125	213,752	76,433	1,523
Laces, embroideries, and lace window curtains	do	do	\$3 per pound	215,750	71,917	1,438
Woven belting for machinery	Pound	do	\$1.18	424,119	500,460	10,009
Cotton bags	do	do	\$1.17	5,908,325	6,910,401	138,203
Quilts, comforts, counterpanes, and bedspreads	Number	do	\$4.00	184,863	739,452	14,789
Bed sheets, pillow, bolster, and mattress cases	Dozen	do	\$18.00	36,803	662,454	13,249
Towels, bathmats, and wash cloths	do	do	\$4.00	907,073	3,628,292	72,566
Other cotton manufactures	do	do	(1)	4,686,196		
Absorbent cotton, gauze, and surgical dressing	Pound	do	\$1.10	3,687,623	4,050,385	81,123
Total, cotton products						7,176,823
<b>(2) TOBACCO PRODUCTS</b>						
Stems, trimming, and scrap tobacco	Pound	2 cents per pound	1.0	10,549,278	10,549,278	210,986
Cigarettes	do	do	2.85 pounds per 1,000	8,455,851	24,099,175	481,984
Chewing tobacco, plug, and other	do	do	0.759	3,885,754	2,949,287	58,986
Smoking tobacco	do	do	0.759	1,120,235	850,258	17,005
Other tobacco manufactures	do	do	0.759	197,734	150,080	3,002
Total, tobacco products						771,963

<sup>1</sup> Statistics not available for conversion factor.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and special orders already granted, the gentleman from New York, Mr. CULKIN, may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of special orders, the gentleman from New York, Mr. CULKIN, may address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EMERGENCY OFFICERS RETIREMENT BILL

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, for some five years the House of Representatives had before it what is known as the emergency officers' retirement bill. It passed two years ago and

was vetoed by the President and passed over the President's veto.

I have no apologies to make for having opposed that bill. Yesterday there was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of those who are the beneficiaries of it. I call it to the attention of the House because it will be extremely interesting reading to those enlisted men in your district who have asked for compensation and been denied to find out how generously you have taken care of the emergency officers during the World War. I call it to your attention because it will give you an opportunity for thought and prayerful study. [Applause.]

#### FREE HIGHWAY BRIDGE ACROSS THE HUDSON RIVER AT TROY, N. Y.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2719) granting the consent of Congress to the superintendent of public works of the State of New York to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River at the southerly extremity of the city of Troy, now on the House Calendar. It is an emergency bridge bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?



Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, I understand from the gentleman that this is an emergency matter?

Mr. PARKER. It is.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the superintendent of public works of the State of New York to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Hudson River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the southerly extremity of the city of Troy, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. WILLIAM H. WELCH

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last, April 8, at noon there was celebrated at the Memorial Continental Hall in this city the eightieth birthday of Dr. William H. Welch, one of the professors of the Johns Hopkins University Medical School, who, together with Sir William H. Osler, Dr. Howard Kelly, and Doctor Halstead founded this medical school. There was present at the gathering in Continental Hall a vast concourse of friends and admirers of Doctor Welch.

Dr. Livingston Farrand, president of Cornell University, opened the ceremonies, and after making an address in which he outlined the life and work of Doctor Welch, he introduced Dr. Simon Flexner, of the Rockefeller Foundation. Then the Hon. Herbert Hoover, President of the United States, addressed the gathering, eulogizing Doctor Welch and speaking of his friendship for him. The response was made by Doctor Welch himself, who, in his very able and at times humorous way, acknowledged the great tribute paid him on the part of the speakers and by the presence of the vast audience.

At the same time that we were celebrating in Baltimore there were also celebrations in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and other cities of our country, as well as Peking, China; Tokyo, Japan; London; and Paris. There has, perhaps, never been a celebration of any American citizen so universally observed as that of Doctor Welch. I have known Doctor Welch for many years; in fact, he lives only about a block from my home in Baltimore. He is and has been for many years president of the University Club, of which I am a member, and through which I come in frequent contact with this distinguished gentleman.

There are few, if any, men who combine such a universal knowledge upon so many subjects in addition to that of his profession as does Doctor Welch. The educational, the public health, as well as the medical profession have all profited greatly through the life and work of our friend. One of our strongest impressions in the work of Doctor Welch is the great amount of good he has accomplished in preventing disease. He has largely changed the aspect of the medical profession since he came to Baltimore and since the foundation of the Johns Hopkins Medical School. Through the discoveries of Doctor Welch and those of his students we have been relieved of many diseases which harassed humanity and brought about epidemics resulting in widespread sickness and death; his attitude has been to prevent rather than to await contraction and then cure.

Another strong feature particularly noticeable in Doctor Welch is his great love for humanity and his sympathy for and with the efforts of those with whom he is associated; especially do I speak of his interest in young men who are starting out on their life work. My brother, Dr. G. Milton Linthicum, who gave me considerable data in the preparation of this speech, spoke of Doctor Welch as "the first citizen in the scientific world," and this I believe is what the medical men and those who know him best delight in terming him.

Doctor Welch was born in Norfolk, Conn., in 1850, the only son of a family who had been noted for physicians for generations, his father and his grandfather also being doctors. He graduated from Yale in the class of 1870, the second of 150 men. For a short while he taught Latin and Greek in Norwich, N. Y., studied chemistry at Sheffield Scientific School, and graduated in medicine at the College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York (now Columbia University) in 1875. Following this graduation he studied at Strassburg, Leipzig, Vienna, Berlin, and Breslau.

In the laboratory of Cohnheim, the great pathologist of that time, and through the faculty of Breslau University, Doctor Welch was brought in contact with this new science. At that time Pasteur, working in France, and Koch, working in Germany, were delving into the world of the little creatures called germs which cause tuberculosis, diphtheria, scarlet fever, and other deadly maladies. Pasteur was not a physician; Koch, who isolated the organism of tuberculosis, was.

Doctor Welch saw Doctor Koch demonstrate the theory of the cause and spread of anthrax, and was one of a small group of students who shared this experience which was really the birth of the new science which has led to the relief of so many men and women from suffering and death. Following this stimulating experience he returned to America in 1879. Shortly afterwards he was offered a lectureship in pathology at Columbia University, but no laboratory being there at that time he declined. A short time later he accepted an offer of the Bellevue Hospital Medical College with its laboratory. He not only conducted his classes through the day but opened night classes and taught men who had graduated, thus really beginning post-graduate instruction. While at Bellevue the Johns Hopkins University was opened, and Dr. Daniel C. Gilman, the president and my friend, was searching for men to fill the various departments in the school of medicine. A friend of Doctor Gilman was in Europe, part of whose business was to find a man suitable to fill the chair of pathology. In an interview with one high in medical authority, who had worked with Doctor Welch in his earlier life, it was suggested that Dr. William H. Welch, because of his eminent ability, be called to the chair rather than some European.

Thus it was that Doctor Welch became one of the four original members of the faculty of the new medical school of which I have spoken. These four men have been immortalized in portraiture by the artist, John Singer Sargent.

The pathological laboratory under Doctor Welch was opened in 1885; from that time on to the present, not only has he developed through research work of various orders, the great advancement in the study of bacteriology and pathology upon the foundation of which have been laid measures for the protection of the health of the Nation in a practical way in the form of sewer systems, filtration plants, control of milk supply, vaccination for typhoid and various other preventative medical measures, but the greatest amount of success in his life work has been the development of men who have gone out to teach and advance the science with which he is so intimately associated. Such men do we find in Walter Reed and James Carroll, who made the discovery of the cause of yellow fever and sacrificed themselves to this work, the result of which was responsible for making possible the construction of the Panama Canal and removing from our Southern States and South America the scourge of yellow fever.

Dr. Simon Flexner, who discovered a curative serum for spinal meningitis, now the head of the Rockefeller Institute, was a pupil of Doctor Welch for eight years, and such work as he has done is largely attributable to the great impetus and influence obtained through his contract with Doctor Welch.

Aside from his research work, Doctor Welch reorganized and advanced the Maryland Board of Health of which he was a member. He was, perhaps, the most potent influence in the establishment of the School of Hygiene and Public Health, the first institution of its kind in the world. It has devoted itself to the training of men for public-health work and has been a great influence in bringing about better health conditions throughout the United States. As a member of the International Health Board, he made two trips to China for the sole purpose of giving aid to China in the establishment of modern medicine, ultimately leading to the organization of the Peking Union Medical College.

Doctor Welch is best known as a teacher and a leader rather than as a scientific discoverer. A man of broad, deep, general culture, with a most attractive personality. While not having occupied a seat in a legislative body at any time, as is customary in European countries, yet he has doubtless influenced more legislation in health measures than any other one individual in the world. By his sympathetic and appealing personality, he doubtless has influenced more wealth to the endowment of the Johns Hopkins Medical School than anyone.

Among other things, he played a great part in the establishment of the Harriett Lane Hospital for children, the Phipps Tuberculosis Clinic, the Phipps Psychiatric Clinic, and finally the great medical library associated with which is a chair of medical history, the honor of which has been conferred upon Doctor Welch, and for which he was the great influence which brought about its fruition. His long association with Baltimore has made his figure and personality familiar to every citizen.

On occasions of public functions there is no greater "drawing card" than Doctor Welch. His geniality and ease of contact have made for him great friends.

He has been president of the University Club of Baltimore for many years, and there his familiar figure may frequently be seen browsing through its library. A great man whose life has been spent in the scientific world, and of such broad sympathies that he has kept himself in contact with the world's citizens, with his feet on the ground, and thereby has influenced for good not only the medical profession but the laymen as well. He was engaged in the World War, where he did valiant service, and is now a brigadier general of the reserve officers' medical corps. He has not only been honored by the world, but has had conferred upon him the Legion of Honor by the French Republic.

At a dinner to Doctor Welch, on April 2, 1910, Dr. William S. Thayer, of Johns Hopkins, the toastmaster, said:

In the laboratory by his side in the early years worked Sternberg and Councilman and Booker and Halsted and Sewall and Bolton and Nuttall and Mall and Abbott and Williams and Howard and Flexner and Hewetson and Barker and Reed and Cullen and Wright and many others. And what suggestion and encouragement did we all receive from the delightful talks when the "Father," as we lovingly called him—when we didn't call him "Popsy"—passed from desk to desk, and from his words at the meetings of the little medical society in the hospital library. But that inspiration was for no small group of men. One by one these students have carried abroad his spirit and his teachings until there is scarcely a laboratory in this country that does not contain men who owe their success to that which Welch has given them.

How rich already are the fruits of his work!

It is to you, Doctor Welch, that Councilman owes the inspiration that has guided his useful and eminent career.

It was your teachings that led to the able work of Mall and indirectly to the establishment of his department of which we are so justly proud.

It was your student, MacCallum, whose contributions to our knowledge of malaria have been referred to by one of the most eminent students in this field, as the most brilliant since the discovery of the parasite.

Reed, Lazear, and Carroll were all your pupils, and it was with you and your old coworker, Sternberg, that Reed discussed and planned the work which led to the greatest achievement of American medicine—the discovery of the method of transmission of yellow fever.

It is your student, assistant and colleague, Flexner, whose absence to-night we so deeply regret, who presides over that great institution in New York, which the world owes to the generosity of Mr. Rockefeller. What a contrast, Doctor Welch, between that magnificent institution and your little laboratory—its legitimate mother!

It is your student, Flexner, whose noble discovery of a curative serum for cerebrospinal meningitis is saving so many precious lives to-day.

It is to your wisdom and initiative more than to any other one influence that are due any successes of the medical school started under your guidance.

#### SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The many years that I have been honored with Doctor Welch's friendship make it a privilege to join in this day of tribute to him by his friends and by the great scientific societies of our country. Doctor Welch has reached his eightieth year, and a whole Nation joins in good wishes to him.

Doctor Welch is our greatest statesman in the field of public health, and his public service to the Nation well warrants our appreciation of him. With profound knowledge, wide experience and skill in dealing with men, sound judgment, and a vision of the future he has been a great asset to the Nation, and we may fortunately hope that he will continue for many years more to bless mankind with his invaluable leadership.

Our age is marked by two tendencies, the democratic and the scientific. In Doctor Welch and his work we find an expression of the best in both tendencies. He not only represents the spirit of pure science but constantly sees and seizes opportunities to direct its results into service of humankind.

Medicine until modern times was a species of dramatic play upon emotions rather than a science made useful through technology. It combined centuries of experience in trial and error in reactions from many drugs, with a maximum of skill on the part of the practitioner in a kindly art of making the patient feel as hopeful and comfortable as possible while he was dying of the disease, the origin and treatment of which was as yet undiscovered. Providence was made responsible for his fate rather than the bacillus, which should never have been allowed to infect him.

Modern medical practice, however, is based upon a vast background of scientific research and discovery. In the creation of this science, in

the conversion of its principles into technical methods for use in actual practice, in the diffusion of knowledge of these principles and methods, and in the application of them upon a national and world-wide scale, Doctor Welch has played a leading American part. As a research worker in pure science he has made original and valuable discoveries. As a technologist he has devised practical methods of applying pure science. As a teacher he has spread true knowledge and inspiration among thousands. But in organizing and directing research and application of medical knowledge on a wider field of prevention of disease he is among the preeminent few who deserve the title of statesman.

No valuable change in everyday practice of any of the great arts has ever been made that was not preceded by the accretion of basic truths through ardent and painstaking research. This sequence that precedes effective action in medicine is equally important in every field of progress in the modern world. It is not the method of stirred public emotions, with its drama of headlines; it is rather the quiet, patient, powerful, and sure method of nature herself.

Doctor Welch has happily combined in his character and intellect the love of truth and the patient experimental habit of the pure scientist, with the ingenuity of the inventor and the organizing vision and energy of the promoter of sound enterprise—and combines all these things with a worldly wisdom and gracious charm that has made him a leader amongst men.

I know that I express the affection of our countrymen and the esteem of his profession in every country when I convey to him their wishes for many years of continued happiness.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS—VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I could not hear all of the colloquy about the procedure next week. I understand that it is generally agreed that we will take up the veterans' legislation on Tuesday next under the rule reported on yesterday, and have 12 hours of general debate. If we do not finish the bill on Tuesday, which we probably will not, then it will be in order the first thing on Thursday, will it not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. And on Friday and Saturday, and so forth, until the bill is finished?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will be the unfinished business.

Mr. RANKIN. And it will take precedence over any other legislation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will simply be the unfinished business of the House, privileged to be called up.

Mr. RANKIN. Would it be subject to be superseded by the so-called Williamson bill, which we had here yesterday?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That would be for the House to decide. There will be two unfinished bills.

#### INVITATION TO VISIT SHENANDOAH VALLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following invitation for the information and convenience of the Members of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 2, 1930.

The Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

*Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Permit me to extend to you and the entire membership of the House a cordial invitation to visit the Shenandoah Valley and make a tour through the enchanted buried city—Grand Caverns. Words nor photographs can describe the beauty and mystery of the place. In one of the great palaces the entire membership of both Houses of Congress could convene, giving you some idea of this wonderland. World travelers justly claim the Grand Caverns to be nature's masterpiece of art work and color in stone and really the world's greatest show place.

In connection with our invitation we suggest that Sunday, May 4, would be an ideal day to make the trip, leaving Washington on a special train at 8 a. m., arriving at Grand Caverns at noon, where luncheon will be served, and then the tour through the Grand Caverns. From the entrance you get a bird's-eye view of the southern entrance of the Shenandoah National Park along the Blue Ridge; you will also see the Piedmont and Shenandoah Valleys in their full spring foliage and the great orchards in full bloom, with the Blue Ridge Mountains wooded to the sky line with riot of colors, presenting a picture no mortal artist could match.

Returning over the Blue Ridge, a stop would be made at Charlottesville and side trip to Jefferson's home at Monticello and through the grounds of Virginia's great university, dinner, and board train for Washington, arriving at bedtime.

No other trip would give to the Nation's public servants more than the one outlined, and the citizens of the old mother State who are donating 400,000 acres of land for the Shenandoah Park would be honored to have as its guests Members of Congress. The only expense



involved would be about \$5 per person for railway transportation. It will be my pleasure to entertain you, and I hope you will endeavor to make the trip.

Awaiting the decision of your great body, I beg to remain,  
Sincerely yours,

HOLLY STOVER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARBER] for a few moments.

Mr. GARBER of Virginia. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I feel I would be somewhat remiss in my duty if I did not add one word by way of emphasis to the invitation that has been extended to the membership of the House to make this unusual trip on May 4. I sometimes think, Mr. Speaker, that the debt of gratitude that the Nation owes to the Old Dominion is temporarily forgotten. I take a moment to suggest that on May 4, if you accept this gracious invitation, you will have an opportunity to visit the State that has given seven Presidents to the Nation. [Applause.] More than that, it is not only the mother of Presidents and the mother of statesmen, but I would remind you that it is also the mother of States, because out of the great Northwest Territory, ceded to the Nation by Virginia in the colonial days, it should be remembered that there were carved out of this wilderness empire the States of Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and a large portion of Michigan. So I urge that you ladies and gentlemen come back to see, metaphorically speaking, your mother on May 4.

Our great old State institution, the University of Virginia, so rich in history and tradition, bids you welcome.

We will show you in your travels through the Shenandoah Valley a scene of unsurpassed beauty. You have here your rolling hills, lying between the mountains, standing in their silent majesty as sentinels guarding the glory of this wondrous valley. You will have here panorama after panorama of beautiful rolling hills, watered by hundreds of crystal streams as they find their way back to the sea. You will literally see here your cattle upon a thousand hills.

The Old Dominion will be most happy to welcome the membership of this House on May 4. I have no interest in the particular caverns whose management extends this invitation. Permit me to say that in my district we have seven of these marvelous subterranean cities hidden away in the earth. The Master was in a very kind mood when he built the great valley of Virginia. He could not spread out before us enough of the glory of His handiwork, and so went beneath the surface and there planted these marvelous cities of idyllic beauty and charm. You are invited to one of the greatest of these on May 4, and I hope very much that you may find it convenient to honor the State with your presence. [Applause.]

#### THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the Consent Calendar is in order, and the Clerk will begin at the point in the call where we left off last.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that instead of commencing at the star, we commence at No. 271 of the calendar. I was not here when the calendar was called, and it was passed over without objection.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I am very friendly to the bill the gentleman refers to, but we can not start there now. With due deference to the gentleman from Ohio, to be fair with all, I must object.

#### AGREEMENT BETWEEN COLORADO, NEW MEXICO, UTAH, AND WYOMING

The first business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 200) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Colorado, Green, Bear or Yampa, the White, San Juan, and Dolores Rivers and all other streams in which such States or any thereof are jointly interested.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### COMPACTS BETWEEN COLORADO, NEBRASKA, AND WYOMING

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 201) granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the North Platte River and other streams in which such States are jointly interested.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest taken in these two bills by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], who is on his sick bed and can not be here, I think it would be well for his colleague [Mr. EATON] to say just a word in extenuation, so to speak, of the action he has taken in reference to this bill.

The first bill makes a division of the waters of the Colorado, Green, Bear or Yampa, the White, San Juan, and Dolores Rivers between the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and the next bill relates to the division of the waters of the North Platte River between the States of Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming.

Mr. SIMMONS. The second bill affects only the States of Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming.

Mr. ARENTZ. The gentleman from Nevada could not get in a word edgewise when the first bill was being considered. The gentleman from Colorado asked to pass over the bill affecting the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. That was on the first bill.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my request was made on account of the illness of my colleague from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR]. I think the bill should be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

#### POLICE FORCE AND FIRE DEPARTMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5713) to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force and the fire department of the District of Columbia.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think these bills affecting questions of salaries ought not to come up by unanimous consent, but in a regular way. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the next bill.

#### PRIZE FIGHTING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9182) to prevent professional prize fighting and to authorize amateur boxing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am not sure that the bill is properly drawn.

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope when it comes up again there will be here a copy of a report of the District Commissioners on this bill and the one to follow it. I think we ought not to be expected to act on these District bills without an expression from them.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I renew the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOPER] that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

#### CLAIMS AND SUITS AGAINST THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9996) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia," approved February 11, 1929.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the bill is not properly before the House, in that it does not meet the requirements of the rule in regard to requirements of the Ramseyer rule pertaining to bills amending existing law.

Mr. GREENWOOD. The gentleman means that it does not conform to the Ramseyer rule?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order inasmuch as the report does not comply with the rule. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9602) to amend the act of Congress approved March 16, 1926, establishing a board of public welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there seems to be no one here to explain this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 599, 600, AND 601 OF SUBCHAPTER 3, CODE OF LAWS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3144) to amend sections 599, 600, and 601 of subchapter 3 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, what is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. STOBBS. Mr. Speaker, replying to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York as to the purpose of this bill, I may say that it passed at the last session of Congress and its purpose is to make it possible for these charitable and educational corporations chartered by the District of Columbia to provide in their by-laws that a quorum of such corporations may consist of less than a majority of the total number of trustees. The reason for that is that many of these charitable and educational corporations desire to have trustees and directors chosen from all over the United States. In order to transact business under the present law they have to have a majority of the trustees present in order to do business.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, the practice seems to be that they want to have window-dressing directorates, which lend respectability, if you please, to the standing of the organization, but many of the trustees and directors decline to take any active part in the activities of the organizations, so that you have organizations that are really conducted by the professional paid workers. I am not referring to any particular organization.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Does not the gentleman think it bad business to allow trustees from different parts of the country to transact business of organizations chartered in the District of Columbia?

Mr. STOBBS. The idea is to have the by-laws provide that a smaller number than a majority shall constitute a quorum. For example, the church that I have the honor to be associated with, the National Memorial Church of the Universalist denomination, desires such a code of by-laws, and I have been asked to be a member of the board of trustees. We can not do any business or transact business as a board of trustees unless we have a majority as a quorum.

Mr. GREENWOOD. If you had an active institution or an effective board, you could transact business, could you not?

Mr. STOBBS. It is not asked to change the law, but to make it possible for a smaller number to constitute a quorum.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I think it is poor policy to allow less than a majority of the board of directors to transact the business of any corporation.

Mr. STOBBS. It is the only way by which national memorial churches, such as the Episcopal Foundation Cathedral, can be handled.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Are they not allowed to have any number of trustees that they want now?

Mr. STOBBS. They can have any number of trustees, but they can not transact business except by a majority.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Then, it is in their control, under existing law, to provide a less number of trustees so that they can have a majority present.

Mr. STOBBS. But as a practical matter that does not work out. I hope the gentleman will not object. This is in behalf of a church.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, the difficulty is that the instance of which the gentleman is speaking and of which he has personal knowledge, is a really meritorious case, but the bill is too broad. It will permit all societies to do that. It may be necessary and expedient in the case of the church mentioned by the gentleman from Massachusetts, but it is a very bad precedent to establish by law in a general statute, so that all societies may do the same thing.

Mr. STOBBS. May I answer that by saying that Congress is absolutely opposed to national incorporations.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; I have objected to every one of them.

Mr. STOBBS. Therefore the only way any body of national character may be incorporated is to be incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. If that is done, no business can be transacted if a majority of the board is required to constitute a quorum, where the trustees are scattered throughout the country. If the law remains as it is at present, and a majority of the directors or trustees is required to constitute a quorum, it is impossible to transact business. The gentleman knows that all the veteran organizations desire to be incorporated under a national act. That has been impossible. We are all opposed to it. They must come to the District of Columbia and be incorporated to give them a national character.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If they are not here, of what use are they as directors?

Mr. STOBBS. They come here once or twice a year, but they are interested in the general policy of veteran organizations. It applies not only to veteran organizations but to church organizations and many others that can not get any relief unless this bill is passed.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOBBS. I yield.

Mr. GREENWOOD. We are not only providing legislation for the corporation which the gentleman has in mind, but many others, and we are providing that they can transact business where less than a majority will constitute a quorum. Unless the gentleman will agree to strike that part of the bill, I intend to object.

Mr. STOBBS. The present law provides for what the gentleman has said, and the only thing I am trying to secure is an amendment which will allow the by-laws to stipulate that a less number than a majority shall constitute a quorum.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I object to that.

Mr. STOBBS. I hope the gentleman will reserve his objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I object.

UNITED STATES NAVAL DESTROYER AND MARINE BASE, SQUANTUM, MASS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6142) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease the United States naval destroyer and submarine base, Squantum, Mass.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, with notice that I am going to object.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, this is a thoroughly meritorious bill. It concerns a large area on the edge of Boston Harbor bought by the Navy during the war for the construction of submarines and destroyers—732 acres.

The Government built upon that property buildings which cost \$12,700,000. Of the 732 acres which the Navy Department possessed, there has been turned over to the War Department 468 acres for aviation and such purpose as the War Department desires.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREW. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We are all familiar with the history of it. There is one question I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts. How does the gentleman justify taking property valued at \$13,000,000 and leasing it out on an agreement to keep up the property?

Mr. ANDREW. There is not any such proposal. There is no lease in existence to-day.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the gentleman desires to lease it?

Mr. ANDREW. We want to lease the property because it is of no use. The 124 acres which remain, on which buildings are erected, are of no immediate purpose to the Navy.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The bill provides for leasing for a period of 25 years.

Mr. ANDREW. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. At an annual rental, the consideration payable in cash or in the form of repairs, maintenance, and upkeep of such property?



Mr. ANDREW. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is ridiculous.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREW. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As a matter of fact, the Navy Department has already leased this property to a corporation for a period of five years.

Mr. ANDREW. Yes. Which was canceled last year.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Navy Department to enter into negotiations to lease it to some people for a period of 25 years?

Mr. ANDREW. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And that is the entire purpose of the bill?

Mr. ANDREW. That is the only purpose of the bill. The only purpose is to lease it for such length of time as will yield to the Government advantageous terms.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREW. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman will not find that in the bill. That can be done under existing law.

Mr. ANDREW. Only for five years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman accept an amendment to lease it for 25 years under existing law?

Mr. ANDREW. I do not understand what the gentleman means.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I mean exactly what I say.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREW. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. The Navy Department now has a right to lease this property for five years?

Mr. ANDREW. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. With the privilege of extending the lease for an additional 5-year period, and so on?

Mr. ANDREW. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Now, if the bill should pass and a lease for 25 years was made and an emergency occurred, then the damages that would accrue to the lessee corporation would be much larger than it would be if a lease was made under existing law? Is that not true?

Mr. ANDREW. This bill provides that the lease shall be revocable at the discretion of the Secretary, in case of national emergency.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; but the person, corporation, or partnership who leased the property would receive damages?

Mr. ANDREW. There is no provision here of that character.

Mr. COLLINS. But that is the case anyway. It exists as a matter of right.

Mr. ANDREW. The difficulty in leasing these expensive buildings has been that the Government can not lease them advantageously for five years at a time. They are in bad repair; they are deteriorating; it is a continual loss to the Government. The buildings are of no use.

Mr. COLLINS. But they are under lease now?

Mr. ANDREW. They are not under lease now; no, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. They are under lease at this moment for a 2-year period. I secured this information this morning.

Mr. ANDREW. They were under lease, issued in 1927, and the lease was canceled last year because the terms were not complied with.

Mr. COLLINS. In a telephone conversation this morning I was advised that this property was under lease now for a 2-year period of time.

Mr. ANDREW. Some one who informed the gentleman, I think, was mistaken, because they were leased for five years, and the lease was canceled last year.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They did not pay the rent?

Mr. ANDREW. They did not pay the insurance.

Mr. COLLINS. The Navy Department should know whether it is under lease or not.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Perhaps that is the squatter, the gentleman who is going to get the lease?

For all the reasons stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I object, Mr. Speaker.

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN A CITIZEN AND A SOLDIER ON H. R. 3547

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 3547, a bill introduced by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on a bill which he has introduced. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend, I submit a discussion of H. R. 3547 in the form of a dialogue:

CITIZEN. I am surprised that an ex-soldier should offer a bill of this kind and that any soldier should attempt to defend it.

SOLDIER. Then you must be amazed at Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, the venerable justice of the Supreme Court, for it was his dissenting opinion in the Schwimmer case which prompted the introduction of this bill.

CITIZEN. Indeed, I am amazed.

#### JUSTICE HOLMES'S OPINION

SOLDIER. Well, Justice Holmes is a veteran of the Civil War, with three battle wounds as permanent symbols and guaranties of his patriotism. Notwithstanding his own opposition to pacifism, he held that one's opinions on the abolition of war should not debar an applicant from citizenship. And he adds this strong language:

"I would suggest that the Quakers have done their share to make the country what it is, that many citizens agree with the applicant's belief, and that I had not supposed hitherto that we regretted our inability to expel them because they believed more than some of us do in the Sermon on the Mount."

Referring specifically to Madam Schwimmer, whose rejection was the subject of this classic dissenting opinion, he states:

"Surely it can not show lack of attachment to the Constitution that she thinks that it can be improved. I suppose that most intelligent people think that it might be. Her particular improvement looking to the abolition of war seems to me not materially different in its bearing on this case from a wish to establish \* \* \* one term of seven years for the President. To touch a more burning question, only a judge mad with partisanship would exclude because the applicant thought that the eighteenth amendment should be repealed."

#### THE GRIFFIN BILL

CITIZEN. Well, all that I know about this Griffin bill is that they say it proposes to relieve the citizen from the obligation to defend the Constitution in time of war.

SOLDIER. It does nothing of the kind.

CITIZEN. What does it do, then?

SOLDIER. Now, you are getting down to brass tacks. Your bias against the bill is obviously a snap judgment influenced by the groundless deductions of a few supersensitive patriots who fear that applicants for citizenship are going to be excused from the obligation to defend the Constitution and the laws—nothing is further from its intent. It would be absurd to grant to naturalized citizens a privilege that was not accorded to native citizens.

CITIZEN. I believe that every citizen—native or naturalized—should not only promise to but actually defend the Constitution.

SOLDIER. Right! But "agreeing to defend" is different from the act of defending. A person might swear to defend the Constitution and yet fall down on the test when war comes.

#### THE TERM "DEFEND"

CITIZEN. But can we defend the Constitution and the laws without bearing arms?

SOLDIER. Yes; in innumerable ways—as nurses, doctors, teachers, as workers on the farm and in the factory—providing the things necessary to carry on the war.

CITIZEN. That's right, now that I think of it. That's why I didn't enlist myself. I had to run my farm to help feed the brave boys at the front.

SOLDIER. And you were probably a "3-minute man" who pepped the boys up to enlist?

CITIZEN. Exactly! I didn't enlist myself, but I stood on the grand stand right next to the chairman of the local draft board when the boys marched away while the band played "Over There." Yes; those were great days and I'll always believe in war.

#### BELIEF IN WAR

SOLDIER. If that's the case, then you differ from any soldier I ever knew who has suffered the hardships of war. You will find yourself differing from the mothers of the sons whom you, and other patriots like you, sicked on to go to the front and—who never came back! You will find yourself differing from the President of the United States, and also you will find yourself at loggerheads with the actual laws of our country.

CITIZEN. How is that?

#### THE KELLOGG PEACE PACT

SOLDIER. Did you never hear of the Kellogg peace pact, more precisely known as the General Pact for the Renunciation of War?

CITIZEN. Yes; but what has that to do with the case?

SOLDIER. Simply this: That from the moment the ratification of the Kellogg peace pact was announced by the President of the United States on July 24, 1929, war has been outlawed.

CITIZEN. Yes; but what does it say?

SOLDIER. It's very short. Here it is:

"ARTICLE 1. The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for

the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

"ART. 2. The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

CITIZEN. Yes; but that's only a treaty.

SOLDIER. Yes; but a treaty is the supreme law of the land under clause 2 of Article VI of the Constitution of the United States, which reads as follows:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

CITIZEN. Then, according to that, this country, as well as all other countries signing the Kellogg peace pact, are committed against war as a means of settling international differences.

#### A SLIGHT INCONSISTENCY

SOLDIER. Yes. And do you not think it strange that an individual, citizen or otherwise, should be penalized for agreeing with the policy and the laws of his or her country?

CITIZEN. Yes. It does seem odd. But suppose that we should get into a defensive war, shouldn't every citizen be compelled to do his duty in defending the country?

SOLDIER. Yes; according to his or her qualifications and in the work for which they are best fitted. This country has never called upon women, for instance, to bear arms and engage in battles.

CITIZEN. No; and, thank God, it never will.

SOLDIER. But it has utilized their services in many ways, and valuable aids they were. It has never called upon persons having religious convictions against war to actually bear arms, and yet they, too, have rendered most valuable services in times of war.

CITIZEN. But there are not many of them, are there?

#### RELIGIOUS BODIES AGAINST WAR

SOLDIER. The World Almanac says that in 1926 there were about 343,000 members of sects in the United States who have conscientious objections to war, divided as follows: Dunkers, 157,000; Friends, 111,000; Mennonites, 75,000. So you see there are quite a number of decent people in these United States who anticipated the Kellogg peace pact long before it was thought of.

CITIZEN. So it would seem.

SOLDIER. Notwithstanding their convictions, it is interesting to note that many of these good people have actually waived their convictions and served in our armies in times of war. For instance, the famous Gen. Nathaniel Greene in our Revolutionary War and Sergeant York in the World War.

CITIZEN. That's news!

#### THE POINT OF THE BILL

SOLDIER. In short, the point of this bill is that while the probability exists that persons might change their minds it is not necessary to reject otherwise good citizens on the mere question as to what they might or might not do in a remote contingency.

CITIZEN. It would seem so.

SOLDIER. All this bill does is to waive the requirement that a person should answer under oath, at the time of naturalization, just precisely what he or she would do in the event of war.

CITIZEN. And it does not excuse them from serving the country in time of war?

SOLDIER. No. In time of war, as at all other times, every citizen must obey the laws and do his or her duty. What that duty is or what that service shall be can well be left to determination when the event of war happens.

CITIZEN. I guess that's about right. I can now see that if it is made a condition precedent of good citizenship that one must believe in war the next step might be to disfranchise all who do not.

SOLDIER. That would hardly be fair, in view of the law on our statute books outlawing war, would it?

CITIZEN. Hardly.

#### GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6343) to provide for the extension of the boundary limits of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the establishment of which is authorized by the act approved May 22, 1926 (44 Stats. 616).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the boundary limits of the tract of land in the Great Smoky Mountains in the States of North Carolina and Ten-

nessee, recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in his report of April 14, 1926, for the establishment of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, be, and the same are hereby, extended to include lands adjacent to the east boundary as defined in said report to a line approximately as follows:

From a point on top of the Balsam Mountains at the boundary of Swain and Haywood Counties just north of Black Camp Gap; thence following east the top of the mountain range to Jonathan Knob and Hemphill Bald; thence along top of ridge through Camp Gap to Bent Knee Knob; thence following the main ridge to Cataloochee Creek to a point on the boundary of the area described in report of the Secretary of the Interior of April 14, 1926; and the lands within said boundary extension, or any part thereof, may be accepted on behalf of the United States in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 22, 1926, for inclusion in the area to be known as the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### MARINE BAND

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6349) authorizing the attendance of the Marine Band at the Confederate veterans' reunion to be held at Biloxi, Miss. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### TRANSPORTATION ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8639) to amend and reenact subdivision (a) of section 209 of the transportation act, 1920.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HOCH. I object.

#### TRADE-MARKS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2828) to protect trade-marks used in commerce, to authorize the registration of such trade-marks, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not like to object to this bill, but it is almost a code of law in itself.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOPER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Although this bill has passed prior Congresses, I would like to have the matter go over for two weeks, so that I may have an opportunity to further consider the bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### GRATUITY TO DEPENDENT RELATIVES OF OFFICERS, ENLISTED MEN, OR NURSES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7639) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize payment of six months' death gratuity to dependent relatives of officers, enlisted men, or nurses whose death results from wounds or disease not resulting from their own misconduct," approved May 22, 1928.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill will not cost the Treasury a dollar. It merely provides additional language desired by the Navy Department so that the determination of the fact of dependency shall rest with the Secretary of the Navy and not with the Comptroller General.

The reason for that language is this: That in many cases of deaths in line of duty the Comptroller General has drawn very fine decisions as to just what the dependency actually was. The language inserted in the bill is in addition to existing law. It is the first proviso on page 3:

*Provided,* That the determination of the fact of dependency in all cases of dependent relatives, of personnel of the Navy or Marine Corps, whether previously designated or not, by the Secretary of Navy, shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.



That is all there is to this legislation. It takes from the Comptroller General the right to determine whether a dependency had in fact existed.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It has oftentimes happened, has it not, that an enlisted man or officer designates some one as entitled to the six months' gratuity; the officer or enlisted man dies, and then when the Navy Department seeks to settle with his estate and give it the six months' gratuity, the Comptroller's office says they are not dependent.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is true.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This leaves it entirely within the discretion of the Navy Department to say who is dependent and not the Comptroller General.

Mr. BRITTEN. In addition to what the gentleman has well said it expedites the settlement of that very unimportant account from the Government's viewpoint.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If the gentleman will permit, I am in sympathy with the purpose of the bill. But, gentlemen, after a great deal of trouble, this Congress created the office of the Comptroller General. Now, are we to destroy the purpose of that office? Are we going to cut down his duties and powers by bills of this kind? It seems to me the Comptroller General can pass upon the question of dependency just as well as the Secretary of the Navy or one of his subordinates.

Mr. COLLINS. And he is a disinterested party.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield further, a great many cases have gone to court in view of the fact that the Comptroller General would hold differently from the Navy Department as to what constituted dependency. An officer or enlisted man designates some particular one of his family who is classified by law as a dependent, and then the Comptroller General comes along and says that although you classify this person as a dependent, in my judgment he is not dependent. Then we say let the Navy Department reach the determination and the man reach the determination instead of the comptroller's office.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Let me suggest that the way to correct that condition is to bring in a bill describing exactly who the dependent may be, in the judgment of your committee and the department, and when it comes to the matter of discretion—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The law already does that.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Just a moment. When it comes to a matter of discretion, or when it comes to construing whether or not the law has been followed, you can not take that power away from the Comptroller General; or, rather, it would be very unwise to do that.

Mr. BRITTEN. If the gentleman will permit a suggestion, my thought, and the committee agrees with me—

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman discussing the point of order?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I have reserved a point of order and in order to give the gentleman an opportunity to discuss it, I now make the point of order the bill is not properly before the House in that it is a bill amending existing law and the report does not show the matters omitted or the new matter inserted in the existing law.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is the gentleman going to insist upon his point of order irrespective of what is said?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Of course, the Speaker will decide the point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. I shall not argue the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] makes the point of order that the report accompanying the bill (H. R. 7639) does not comply with the so-called Ramseyer rule. The Chair has inspected the report and finds it does not so comply, sustains the point of order, and refers the bill to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The Clerk will report the next bill on the Consent Calendar.  
INDIAN HOMESTEADS ON THE CROW, THE BLACKFEET, AND THE FORT BELKNAP RESERVATIONS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9761) to authorize the issuance of patents in fee for Indian homesteads on the Crow Reservation, the Blackfeet Reservation, and the Fort Belknap Reservation, in the State of Montana, upon written application therefor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to cause to be issued a patent in

fee simple, upon written application therefor, to any Indian allottee of the Crow, Blackfeet, or Fort Belknap Reservations, in Montana, for land allotted as a homestead and now inalienable, whenever he shall be satisfied that any such allottee is competent and capable of managing his or her affairs, and thereafter all restrictions as to sale, encumbrance, or taxation of said land shall be removed and said land shall not be liable to the satisfaction of any debt contracted prior to issuance of such patent.

SEC. 2. That any Crow, Blackfeet, or Fort Belknap Indian allottee may sell, upon petition, all or part of any land allotted as a homestead, and the heirs of any deceased Fort Belknap allottee may sell all or any part of an inherited homestead: *Provided*, That such sales shall be made only with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TRIBAL FUNDS OF THE YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE OF INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 188) authorizing the use of tribal funds belonging to the Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians, in South Dakota to pay expenses and compensation to the members of the tribal business committee for services in connection with their pipe-stone claim.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill a question. I do not think this is a serious matter, but I notice in the joint resolution, in line 4, the amount originally appeared as \$400 and a line has been stricken through that and \$4,000 substituted.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. It should have been \$4,000 in the original drafting of the bill.

Mr. HOOPER. Then that is a mistake; it is not \$400?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. No; \$4,000.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations. How many members were on this committee?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. I am not able to say; but it was a business committee appointed at a meeting of this tribe on August 23, 1924.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I suppose they were the politicians of the tribe?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Well, I do not know. They were the ones who had in hand the matter of securing this claim. They are the ones the tribe selected to gather the evidence and prosecute the claim.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. They came to Washington, did they?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes; they came here, and they also gathered evidence elsewhere.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Were there more than four of them?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes; I think there were some six or eight, as I recall, although my memory on that is not clear at this time. It was the business committee selected by the tribe for this purpose.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Four thousand dollars is a lot of money to give a voluntary commission. There was nothing of this kind in contemplation at the time.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Let me say that this matter extended over a number of years, and it was largely due to their activity that the claim was approved, and the department held out of the distribution this \$4,000 as a reasonable amount to cover their expenses and the fees, but felt it could not pay this over to this committee without authority to do so from the Congress.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Did the tribe get the \$328,558.90?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I suppose it was not paid to them, but went into the tribal funds?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. No; I think distribution has been made and this \$4,000 was retained at that time by the commissioner.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And the tribe is satisfied with this arrangement?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes. So far as I have been advised and informed, this meets with their approval.

Mr. HOOPER. As I understand, there was a considerable amount actually paid out of the tribal fund for the expenses about which the gentleman has spoken?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Not to this committee. My understanding is they have not been paid anything.

Mr. HOOPER. They have not received anything at all?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. That is my understanding; and this \$4,000 includes their expenses.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. What was the amount of the judgment in the Court of Claims?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. The original claim as found, I think, was something over \$100,000, but when the settlement was made it all amounted to \$328,558.90.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. What were these Indians, who are to receive the benefit of this bill, doing down here, lobbying?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. That I really do not know. They were here and doing the same as anyone who is prosecuting a claim—gathering evidence and presenting it to their attorney and getting it in shape to present to the court.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman know whether the attorneys who received attorneys' fees by reason of their services in this claim before the court brought these Indians to Washington? If so, why should not the attorneys pay their expenses?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. No; that was not the case. This business committee was appointed by the tribe at a meeting on August 23, 1924; to take up the matter of the prosecution of this claim, which had been pending for many years. I presume they are the ones who engaged attorneys and looked after the details of the prosecution, the same as any other client would do.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is absolutely certain that the tribe had directed these Indians, who are the beneficiaries under this bill, to come down to Washington and represent the tribe, and that they did not come here voluntarily, and then after the claim went through request compensation?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. No; they had a meeting of the tribe down at Greenwood in August, 1924, and these men were selected as a business committee to take charge of the case, secure legislation submitting the claim to the court, and follow up the claim through the court. I believe they also gave the matter attention after the court had passed on the case in the way of securing the proper appropriation, but especially they were to gather the evidence necessary to sustain the claim.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. And the amount in the bill covers the actual expenses only.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Expenses and compensation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to use not to exceed \$400 of the tribal funds standing to the credit of the Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians, in the State of South Dakota, in the Treasury of the United States arising from a judgment of the Court of Claims on claim No. D-546, known as the pipestone claim, decided April 16, 1928, to pay the expenses and compensation of the members of their tribal business committee on a quantum meruit basis for service rendered the tribe and expenses in connection with the prosecution of said claim No. D-546 in pursuance of the action taken by the general tribal council held by the tribe at Greenwood, S. Dak., on August 23, 1924, by authority of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, whereby the said tribal business committee was created and members duly appointed to serve thereon to carry out the wishes of the tribe.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the figures "\$400" and insert "\$4,000."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "committee," insert "or their heirs."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COLLECTION OF FEES FOR WORK DONE FOR THE BENEFIT OF INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10627) to amend the act of February 14, 1920, authorizing and directing the collection of fees for work done for the benefit of Indians.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the item contained in the act approved February 14, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 415; U. S. C., title 25, sec. 413), authorizing and directing the collection of fees to cover the cost of certain specified work performed for the benefit of Indians, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized in his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to collect reasonable fees to cover the cost of any and all work per-

formed for Indian tribes or for individual Indians, to be paid by vendees, lessees, or assignees, or deducted from the proceeds of sales, leases, or other sources of revenue: *Provided*, That the amounts so collected shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, except when the expenses of the work are paid from Indian tribal funds, in which event they shall be credited to such funds: *Provided further*, That where fees for work paid for from Indian tribal funds have heretofore been collected and deposited as miscellaneous receipts under the said act of February 14, 1920, the amounts thereof are hereby authorized to be appropriated and credited on the books of the Treasury to the funds charged with the cost of the work."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ACQUISITION OF TIDELANDS AT FORT LEWIS, WASH.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3311) to authorize the acquisition of certain tidelands for sewer purposes at Fort Lewis, Wash.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARBOUR, Mr. LAGUARDIA, and Mr. CRAMTON objected.

#### TO PROVIDE FOR THE USE OF THE U. S. S. "OLYMPIA" AS A MEMORIAL

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10296) to provide for the use of the U. S. S. *Olympia* as a memorial to the men and women who served the United States in the war with Spain.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I object.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Last summer a board of officers of the Navy ordered this historical vessel junked. A nationwide protest from Spanish War veterans resulted.

I telegraphed the Secretary of the Navy at the request of the Spanish War organization in my city, and the Secretary said that he would withhold action to see whether or not Congress desired to preserve the ship. The ship, as the gentleman knows, was the flagship of Admiral Dewey at the Battle of Manila Bay, and is a historical vessel. Every Spanish War organization in the country has indorsed by resolution this bill to save the ship. The bill carries an appropriation of \$25,000. The purpose is to use the ship as a memorial in the city of Washington to the men who served in the Spanish War. If it was proposed to construct a memorial to those who served in the war with Spain it would cost several million dollars, and there would be no objection to such a measure. Here is an opportunity to save the Government money and have a suitable memorial. This is to cost \$25,000, and we ask for the \$25,000 to paint and get the ship here, and a small amount for maintaining it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman has another bill on the calendar, a very good bill. The gentleman is industrious. His bill pertains to public lands for the veterans and is an excellent bill, and I am with it on that. But, the gentleman recognizes, of course, that this will cost \$25,000 to paint the vessel and tow her here. It will cost half a million dollars to recondition her, and it will take a personnel of 10 or 12 men to keep the vessel in good shape. You can not leave a vessel without any care.

Now, we have on the floor a great naval expert, in the person of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], who will corroborate this. This ship would serve no scientific purpose. It is not a large ship, and it does not justify the cost of maintenance.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I have talked with experts of the Navy Department and they told me they can scrape the bottom for \$2,500 and paint the ship for \$5,000, and that is all it is necessary to do. The ship is now in first-class condition for the purpose for which it is to be used. The Spanish War veterans are going to hold services on it in the Philadelphia Navy Yard on the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*. It will not cost a nickel to recondition it because there is no use in reconditioning it.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman says that I am an expert, and I am going to try and prove it.

The question before the House is as to whether we are going to preserve this historic ship. The most interesting features of Paris, Berlin, London, of all of the old cities of the Old World are their historic monuments and relics. To bring the *Olympia* to Washington, where the school children from this area and visitors from all over the United States can see it, is worth a thousand times more than the paltry \$20,000 or \$25,000 that is authorized under this bill. It will not cost anything like that to



bring the ship here and to paint and scrape it. As to reconditioning, it will not be reconditioned; it will be kept clean, and left as it is. It should be preserved. We ought to keep it for a hundred years, or a thousand years, for those that come after us—for the Spanish-American War veterans and their children and their grandchildren to look at. It is the preservation of an historic relic, and the expenditure of \$25,000 is nothing for so important a cause. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Secretary of the Navy says that after the vessel has been located a force of 10 or 12 men will probably be required for cleaning and watchmen, and the cost of that would, according to the bill, be borne by the Office of the Public Buildings and Public Parks.

Mr. BRITTEN. It may take four or five men. They will be enlisted personnel, and they will be around there working just as they are around obsolete ships at the navy yard. As far as the appropriation is concerned, the House will never hear of it, if the Navy takes care of it. The bill provides that the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Parks may have charge of it. I think it is a good bill, and I hope that the gentleman will not insist upon his objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Would the gentleman prefer to have it go over without prejudice?

Mr. BRITTEN. I would like to have the gentleman withdraw his objection.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I prefer, if the gentleman is going to ask that the bill go over, that the gentleman object, because it will require three objectors next time.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then, Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Missouri, I object.

#### SALARIES OF NAVAL ACADEMY BAND

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10380) adjusting the salaries of the Naval Academy Band.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall object unless some explanation is made of it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman permit me to make an explanation of the bill, so that his objection may be removed?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have an objection which I do not think the gentleman can remove.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have another one also.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, let us take one at a time. Will the gentleman from Michigan withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am simply trying to conserve the time of the House. If the gentleman desires, I shall reserve the objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the author of this bill, Mr. GAMBRILL, of Maryland, is unavoidably absent to-day on account of the death and funeral of his father. Being quite familiar with the bill, I consented to explain any objections that might arise.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is one that is definite with me. We have a joint committee studying the pay of the Army and the Navy and of other services. Why should we be fooling along here piecemeal with certain members of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am glad the gentleman raised that question, because his statement is not applicable at all. This bill has no relation whatsoever to, nor does it interfere with, the prerogatives of the joint pay bill. I grant you that if it did I would say, let the joint pay committee settle the question of compensation and not take it up in this way.

What does this bill do? It merely assigns a rating to the Naval Academy Band. What does the joint pay bill do? It makes the basis of compensation according to the rating, and so the joint-pay committee would have no jurisdiction over this matter at all.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is it not possible that the joint committee may want to give some consideration to ratings as well as to terms of pay?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that it would require a repeal by the joint-pay committee of two acts of Congress.

Mr. CRAMTON. That would be all right, if it saves money.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But there is no assurance that it will save money. Before the joint-pay committee can consider the Naval Academy Band, you must repeal the act of 1919 or the act of 1925.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is no one in the Army and the Navy getting pay who does not get it because of some existing law. I will either consent to this bill being passed over without prejudice or object to it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, when a gentleman makes an objection, he is usually willing for any Member on the floor to endeavor to satisfy his objection and show that it is not well founded. I am satisfied the gentleman from Michigan is broad-minded enough, if I can demonstrate his objection is not meritorious, not to insist on it. The joint-pay committee deals with the question of compensation, and not with the question of rating.

Mr. CRAMTON. I shall be disappointed as one Member, if that committee permits itself to be hedged about by such technicalities as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. All right. I know no better answer than to state that that is exactly what happened to the 1922 pay bill. What happened to the 1922 pay bill when we had a joint pay bill was that they did not even take it into consideration.

Mr. JENKINS. What is the reason why the Navy Department opposes this?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I suppose they do not want these musicians to receive a higher rate of pay. The Naval Academy band was created by special act of Congress in 1919. That act designated a certain number of first-class musicians and a certain number of second-class musicians. The Navy Department does not insist that the band must be made up of musicians of the first class and second class. The purpose is to repeal the act of 1919 and put it in the discretion of the department to determine how many musicians shall be put in these different classes. The Navy Department can increase or decrease the number in the Navy Band, but can not do it in the case of the Naval Academy Band. For that reason the pay bill will not touch this matter at all. It did not touch it in 1922, and it will not now, because in order to touch it you must repeal the act of 1919 and the act of 1922.

Mr. CRAMTON. The only way that the joint committee can accomplish anything as to the Army and Navy pay is to consider the various statutes fixing the rates of pay. They will have to recommend amendments to the law in proposing any change. The report of the committee on this bill says:

If this bill becomes a law, the complement and pay of the Naval Academy Band will be substantially the same as the Navy Band, and the increased cost to the Government will be between ten and eleven thousand dollars.

That statement makes it clear that the purpose of this bill is to fix the pay, whether you do it through the means of changing the pay of these men or changing the rating. Whatever naval technicalities you resort to, it is to change the pay.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman has just read a statement from the report regarding the purpose of the bill, to permit the Navy Department to change the complement.

Mr. CRAMTON. It says, "If this bill becomes a law, the complement"—I suppose that means the number; it is not a compliment to their musical ability?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No.

Mr. CRAMTON. It provides that the pay shall be substantially as that of the Navy Band.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under the act of 1919 the Navy Department can not do that, because the act of 1919, creating the band, says there must be 45 first-class musicians and 27 second-class musicians. There is no assurance by the passage of this law that the Naval Academy Band will cost more than it is costing to-day, or that the men will get more money.

Mr. CRAMTON. They might cut it in two and reduce the number; but, knowing the Navy, I do not think that will happen.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is a great deal of reduction taking place in the Navy to-day.

Mr. CRAMTON. So far as this statute is concerned, if the committee is studying the pay of the Army and Navy and trying to adjust inequalities that exist—and there may be inequalities—in their effort to adjust inequalities they will recommend a change in the law of 1919.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does the gentleman think that they are going to come back here with a report repealing the organic law? It can not say it will reduce the number of the Coast Guard or any other organization, but it can fix the pay.

Mr. CRAMTON. The report says that if this bill becomes a law the pay of the Naval Academy Band will be substantially that of the Navy Band.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The joint committee can not fix the complement.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not talking about the complement. The committee reported that if this bill becomes a law the pay of the Naval Academy Band will be substantially the same as the Navy Band.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The pay can not be substantially the same as that of the Navy Band unless you change the as-

signments. Suppose this joint committee had the right to consider the compensation of Members of Congress. Do you think they could go into the question of how many Members of Congress shall be here? Their jurisdiction is as to compensation and not complement. You have first got to have the proper complement, and the bill is entirely one of assignment and not of pay.

Mr. CRAMTON. What would the gentleman say to striking out of this bill everything but that they can have as many musicians as the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe? That would take care of the complement.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. A subcommittee was appointed, and that subcommittee made an investigation. The subcommittee included the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] and others, and they worked together; and we think that the bill as now drafted does justice to the Naval Academy Band by giving them a new assignment, not dealing with the question of pay.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. May I call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], whose judgment I always follow in matters of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Interior, that this band is just as much a part of the faculty as any professional man there. This band works more than any band in the service, I believe. In fact, they are split up into three parts in the mornings for the various drills. It is impossible to get musicians to remain in the service at the present pay. The gentleman from Michigan will recall that some years ago there was a great deal of trouble because the musicians at Annapolis were engaging in trades just outside of the reservation. That was prohibited by law. We must have a band at Annapolis. The pay of the band will not be reached by the joint pay committee which is studying the pay of commissioned officers.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is true. These men are enlisted men. Not a single man here is an officer. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has brought up a very important question.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does either gentleman assert that these enlisted men are considered as a part of the faculty of the Naval Academy?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Well, the faculty can not get along without them.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They are enlisted men. Every one is a warrant officer, and he may be assigned anywhere.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] say that music is not a cultural part of the education of a young officer of the United States Navy?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is highly desirable, but not everyone who contributes to the education and development of the young midshipman is considered a member of the faculty.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under the law to-day, a member that is assigned to the Navy Band may be ordered by the Bureau of Navigation to any place in the service. In view of the law of 1919 the Navy Department can not order one of the enlisted men who has been assigned to the Naval Academy Band to any other place except that one place. That is one great advantage of getting away from this hard, fixed rule, and having some elasticity in the law.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I think it would be better to give them more pay.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am not asking for pay. I am asking for the proper rating, and then the joint pay committee can discuss that question when it considers it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will not this bill give them more pay?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course not. It gives them the proper assignment, and then the assignment takes care of the pay.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The men are already in the service.

Mr. CRAMTON. What would the gentleman from Georgia think of the substitute which I have offered for his bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I hope the gentleman will not offer any substitute, because I would like to see this band put upon an equality with the band in Washington.

Mr. CRAMTON. When the Board of Visitors of which my friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] may be a member at any time, goes to Annapolis and the band turns out to meet it, I hope it will be a good big band, and therefore I propose, as a substitute, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Naval Academy Band shall hereafter consist of one leader, one second leader, and of such enlisted men as may be assigned to that band by the Navy Department.

That will give the Secretary of the Navy authority to make just as large a band as he thinks ought to be proper for the arrival of the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is placing me in an embarrassing position. If the gentleman will withdraw his objection, then I will not object to him offering it on the floor, but, of course, I would have to oppose his amendment. If the gentleman from Michigan feels there is something in the amendment, the committee will take up the amendment if the gentleman will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. I fear that the influence of the gentleman from Georgia, together with the assistance of my friend from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], might make it difficult to get away from this pay bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman does not have to bring up any such proposition as this.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have in my hand the joint resolution which was passed by this Congress, and it deals with a tremendously important subject, the pay of the Army and Navy, and as far as I am concerned while that committee is at work I am not going to permit any legislation to pass which either directly or indirectly changes the pay of the members of the Army or Navy establishments.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. That resolution provides that—

A joint committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the Vice President, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall make an investigation and report recommendations by bill or otherwise to their respective Houses relative to the readjustment of the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the several services mentioned in the title of this joint resolution.

Now, whatever should be done with reference to pay I think can wait until that joint committee completes its work. Therefore I am obliged to object.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will withhold my objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I would like to ask, as a matter of information, what is the difference in pay between an enlisted man and a man who is in the band?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It all depends upon his rating. Of course, an enlisted man begins as a seaman, first class, and he receives so much. After being in the service he may become a warrant officer and be eligible for assignment to the band. It depends entirely upon the rating received.

Mr. GREENWOOD. He does get additional pay for being in the band?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. He gets the rating of that class. If he is a warrant officer, first class, he gets the pay of a warrant officer, first class. He does not get any additional compensation because he is in the band.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Is he elevated to this class because he is in the band?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. One of the suggestions made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] is that this joint commission will study the pay of the entire Army and Navy. We, however, have only one Naval Academy Band. This situation is comparable only to the band at the Military Academy at West Point, and we have already taken care of that. So that in all likelihood they will be forgotten and they will be entirely out of the picture when the report of the joint pay commission is submitted to Congress.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. BURTNESS. The gentleman has referred to a matter that I wanted to inquire about. How does the situation at the Naval Academy compare with the situation at the Military Academy at this time? Surely they should be comparable.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I imagine that the injustice that is so apparent in the Navy Band does not exist in the Army, but I can not speak of that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would like to submit another reason for objecting.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will state to the gentleman that he does not have to offer to the House any reason why he objects. He has a right to object any time he pleases.



Mr. CRAMTON. But I have another objection for the gentleman to shoot at. If the President is going to succeed in his effort to keep down expenditures, the Budget system must amount to something. I imagine there are a dozen bills on this Consent Calendar coming from the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which not more than one or two are recommended to Congress by the department.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I ask the gentleman from Michigan to point them out.

Mr. CRAMTON. The bill under consideration is not recommended by the department.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. For the reason that the Budget advises against it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly.

Mr. CRAMTON. The next one is exactly in the same position. No. 299 is the one we have before us. No. 300, by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], is likewise not recommended by the department or the Budget. No. 301 is not recommended by the department or the Budget. I think that No. 302, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia, is not recommended by the department or the Budget. I have not taken a complete census, but inasmuch as I ran onto four or five, one after another, none of them recommended by the Budget, I concluded that the Committee on Naval Affairs has no sympathy with the Budget system.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The members of the Committee on Naval Affairs believe they know as much about these bills as the Budget.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will not dispute that; but I will say the Budget must have some weight if we are to have Federal economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

#### RETIREMENT OF DISABLED NURSES IN THE NAVY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10375) to provide for the retirement of disabled nurses in the Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to know how the provisions for the retirement of these Navy nurses compare with the provisions made for other nonmilitary employees of the Government?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I do not know that there is anything comparable to it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How does the gentleman justify taking these employees and providing that if they are disabled in line of duty they shall then and there be retired on three-fourths pay and allowances, while if an employee of the Post Office Department is crushed by a mail truck and his case goes before the Employees' Compensation Bureau, he does not receive anything like three-fourths of his pay.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I think the circumstances are entirely different. A Navy nurse is not a civilian employee. A Navy nurse, as every Member of this House ought to know, is subject to all the hazards of her profession here and elsewhere.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. So is every other employee.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I have reference to things other than those met with by civilian employees of the Government. For instance, a Navy nurse finds it necessary at times to do duty in the Tropics; she finds it necessary to serve aboard hospital ships and transports at sea. Before she can be appointed as a member of the Navy Nurse Corps she is given a very careful and a very thorough physical examination. This examination is so very rigid that comparatively few are successful in passing it. Everyone will agree, I think, that the Government should be given this protection. After her appointment she serves for three years at \$70 per month, or approximately \$2.33 per day. Nurses serving in a civilian capacity make anywhere from \$6.50 to \$10 per day.

The Navy nurse works for less than one-half what the civilian receives. In addition she gets her quarters. That is all she gets beyond what a civilian nurse receives as a daily or weekly stipend.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. She gets permanent employment.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes; but a good civilian nurse has no difficulty whatsoever in finding all the employment she wants, and when she is so employed she receives more than twice as much as the Navy nurse.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman should not make it as broad as that. She gets retirement and she gets permanent employment.

Mr. WOODRUFF. She only receives retirement after at least 20 years' service, and, as I have said before, she comes into the service at pay far below that which she could get as a civilian nurse. What happens to her in case she is disabled by reason of her service? Certainly she has not been able to lay aside enough money from her meager salary upon which to live. She does have a pensionable status, which would, probably, pay her not to exceed \$30 per month. Does any Member of this House believe that a nurse or any woman can live in any way comfortably on \$30 per month?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; neither can an employee of the Post Office Department.

Mr. WOODRUFF. On the other hand, an employee of the Post Office Department is not subject to the same hazards of employment that a nurse in the Navy is subjected to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would not say that.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes; the gentleman would if he would be fair.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Do not quarrel with me, because I am not going to object.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, because I am going to object, the Secretary of the Navy reports adversely against this bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF. No. The Secretary of the Navy, I think, makes no report on it.

Mr. COLLINS. The committee report states that he recommends against the enactment of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF. That is all right, but in the same report, if the gentleman will scan it carefully, he suggests to the Naval Affairs Committee that if they propose to act favorably on the bill that he be permitted to give us an outline of the bill which he thinks should be adopted. The bill now before the House is the bill suggested by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. COLLINS. In addition, the Secretary of the Navy suggests that the enactment of this bill will cost additional money. In addition he adds this statement:

Had this legislation been in effect in all probability there would have been additional retirements for physical disability.

In other words, if this had been the law we would have had more on the retired list than we have now.

Mr. WOODRUFF. No; because, as I understand it, we have no nurses on the retired list at the present time for physical disability.

Mr. COLLINS. Then the Secretary of the Navy is wrong in his statement.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am telling the gentleman what the facts are, and if he will examine the hearings he will find I am speaking with full knowledge of the facts.

Mr. COLLINS. I am quoting from a letter to the Committee on Naval Affairs from the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I understand that; and let me say to the gentleman that the members of the Naval Affairs Committee could not understand just how the Navy Department arrived at its conclusion, because these are the facts.

Mr. COLLINS. In other words, the Secretary of the Navy does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am stating he did not know what he was talking about in this instance, and I am going to tell the gentleman why. If he will scan the hearings, he will find testimony from several high ranking officers of the Navy to the effect that at the present time nurses who are disabled in line of duty are not retired. There are a number of these unfortunate women scattered about the country in the several Navy hospitals. Three or four suffering from tuberculosis are in the Denver hospital; one in Washington, one in Philadelphia, and others in other hospitals. To the everlasting credit of the Navy Department I will say that they are kept on the pay roll in hospitals under treatment at full pay, and it must be apparent that if the law and the conditions were such that these nurses could be retired on three-fourths pay, we would be saving at least one-fourth of the money we are paying them now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I will be very pleased to yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman stated there is no retirement feature granted to the nurses of the Navy to-day.

Mr. WOODRUFF. For disability, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I read the law, after they have served 30 years or reached the age of 50, having served 20 years, then they have the retirement privilege.

Mr. WOODRUFF. But not for disability. That is retirement for service. They can retire at any time after they reach the age of 50, provided they have served 20 years.

Mr. STAFFORD. And they have a pensionable status prior to reaching the age of 50?

Mr. WOODRUFF. A very modest one at all times. They can secure a pension, but it is so utterly inadequate for their needs that it is unthinkable the Navy would under present conditions dismiss them because of disability.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am referring to their retired pay after 30 years of service.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes; they can secure not more than 75 per cent of their pay.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. How does the law applicable to the Navy nurses compare with the law applicable to Army nurses?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Under the law as it is at present they are on exactly the same status.

Mr. COLLINS. Another objection I have to the bill is that it is a bill carrying an increase in pay, and it should be considered by the joint committee on pay for these two services.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I do not think it is. In my opinion, it is simply giving to this very splendid body of women—

Mr. COLLINS. An increase in pay.

Mr. WOODRUFF (continuing). A measure of justice they are entitled to and some inducement to come into the nursing service of the Navy and stay there. There is nothing in the bill which changes the pay status as provided by existing law. I wonder if the gentleman understands and realizes how difficult it is to-day to secure the requisite number of nurses for the Navy. There has not been a time in the last five years when we have had all the nurses in the Navy we are supposed to have, simply because of the fact it is difficult to get them into this service. It must not be forgotten that this bill gives nothing to the nurse who voluntarily leaves the service. In order to receive the benefits of it she must be disabled in line of duty.

Mr. COLLINS. I understand you have around 300 applicants.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And out of that 300 we would perhaps secure 30 or 40. We are right now below what we should have in the Navy. There are 520 nurses authorized, and there are now in the corps 507, I believe.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### HOSPITALIZATION—FLEET NAVAL RESERVE AND FLEET MARINE CORPS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10662) providing for hospitalization and medical treatment of transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in Government hospitals, without expense to the reservist.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is another bill that is in harmony with the general policy of the Naval Affairs Committee of disregarding the Budget. It is true the Secretary of the Navy makes a report from which one might infer that the Navy is in favor of the bill, and then concludes with the statement that it was referred to the Budget and the Budget recommended against its enactment, and hence the department does not make a recommendation.

I do not care so much about any of these little bills, but I am concerned with whether our Budget system is going to be shot full of holes by the Navy Department. If the administration will permit the submission of these reports—that I will not call hypocritical, but reports that are at least ingenious, going as far as they can in manifesting approval without saying in so many words that they approve of the bill—if the administration is going to permit any department to indulge in this kind of pastime, a kind of blindman's buff game with the Budget, you are going to ruin the Budget system. I submit that the Navy Department ought not to have any privileges that any other department does not have. If the Navy Department can make this kind of very smooth and adroit report indicating approval without saying so, the other departments not only will have the right but they will be alert enough to adopt the policy, and then you might as well throw your Budget in the discard.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And if the gentleman will permit, the Navy Department indulges in that more than any other department.

Mr. CRAMTON. The Navy Department does it more than any other, unless it is the Army. [Laughter.]

Mr. EVANS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. EVANS of California. Since the Navy Department's letter was written to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, a very substantial part of the expense that would be incurred by the passage of this bill has been eliminated by cutting out of the bill the refund feature.

Mr. JENKINS. If the gentleman will permit right there, is that the difference between the bill H. R. 2944 and the present bill?

Mr. EVANS of California. Exactly.

Mr. CRAMTON. May I ask why the committee has done that?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Michigan has criticized the Navy Department and the Army for overriding the Budget. Is it not a fact that the Navy got into that habit due to the policy oftentimes practiced by the Appropriation Committee by making appropriations for unexpended balances and overriding the Budget? When the gentleman comes to criticize any department for overriding the Budget he must bear in mind that the gentleman's own committee has been guilty of the same practice.

Mr. CRAMTON. The only difference between the gentleman and myself is that my statement is in accordance with the facts whereas his statement is not in accordance with the facts; otherwise we are in agreement. [Laughter.] I will say this: The gentleman may refer to the subcommittee with reference to naval appropriations, but I am sure that he would never make the charge against the subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriations. And let me say for the subcommittee handling appropriations for the Navy Department that it is entitled to the full sympathy for when it takes the job of trying to hold down the demands of the Army and the Navy it may have to resort to extreme measures.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am not criticizing the subcommittee.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. BURTNESS. I would like to ask the gentleman a serious question: Where a department is in favor of legislation which they may have worked for and desired for a number of years, and in which they are interested in getting legislation of that type, and in the regular course of legislation they find that the Bureau of the Budget is opposed to it for financial reasons—where the department actually wants it and where it is confronted by the Bureau of the Budget, just what sort of a report should the department make to a congressional committee that would be fair to all parties?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say to the gentleman that what will have to be done if the Budget means anything, that it should be remembered that the Commissioner of the Budget is the right hand of the President. He is supposed to be carrying out the policy of the President with reference to appropriations.

The Secretary of Navy and the Secretary of War and every other Cabinet officer is also an aide to the President, and is supposed to be carrying out the administration's policy. When a Cabinet officer ceases to support the President in his financial policy the administration will be demoralized and the Budget system will cease to be of any value.

Hence the Secretary of the Navy can report that the matter has been discussed with the Budget and the Budget renders an adverse report; they can go further and present the facts as to what the bill is and what it does without the phrases that they so adroitly put in.

Mr. BURTNESS. If the department is favorable to the legislation except for the fact that the Bureau of the Budget is against it for financial reasons, and Congress asks for a report, is it not entitled to the facts from the department on the general merits?

Mr. CRAMTON. If this kind of a report continues you will have the Budget system shot full of holes.

Now, I would like an answer to the question I asked, why the committee did make the change referred to?

Mr. EVANS of California. In the hearings the gentleman has observed in reference to this that Admiral Leigh, representing the Navy Department, appeared before the committee and states unequivocally that he is in favor of this bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman does not answer my question.

Mr. EVANS of California. What is it?

Mr. CRAMTON. Why did the committee make the change?

Mr. EVANS of California. Because the committee was not in favor of the refund feature of the bill.

This bill was introduced originally by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] when he was a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. It was considered at length by the committee and unanimously approved after the gentleman from New Jersey ceased to be a member of that committee. He is entitled to the credit for introducing the legislation; I am not, although my name happens to appear as the author of the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. What became of H. R. 2944 in the Seventieth Congress?



Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2944 was introduced, as the gentleman from California [Mr. EVANS] has stated, by me while I was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. After the introduction of that bill on May 14, 1929, the opinion of the Navy Department concerning the provisions of the bill was requested by the committee. The letter of January 14, 1930, which appears in the committee report accompanying H. R. 10662, and which is now under consideration, is in answer to the request of the committee, and refers to H. R. 2944, which was introduced, as already stated, by me. The report of the Navy Department contained in the letter which I have referred to indicates that the Bureau of the Budget had advised the Navy Department that the proposed legislation would not be in accord with the financial program of the President. This evidently refers to that portion of H. R. 2944 which provides a refund to the beneficiaries of the bill for subsistence already deducted. The Committee on Naval Affairs has undoubtedly given careful consideration to this feature of the bill and has considered that, in view of the objection, it might be well to eliminate that portion of the measure.

However, whether this be the exact reason or not, the fact is that on March 12, 1930, Mr. EVANS, a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, introduced H. R. 10662, which is identical with the bill introduced by myself, except the retroactive feature.

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the hospitalization of retired men of the Navy and Marine Corps and transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve without deduction for hospital rations from their pay.

The very carefully prepared report of the committee in this matter informs us that:

At present hospitalization of all naval personnel is paid for out of the naval hospital fund. This is a trust fund of which the Secretary of the Navy is the sole trustee. It is made up of money drawn from various sources, of which the following are pertinent:

Twenty cents per month deducted from the pay of each officer, seaman, and marine of the Navy, including those on the retired list and those in the reserve.

Ration allowance of one ration per day for each officer, seaman, and marine during his continuance in hospital. The value of the ration for this purpose being provided under appropriation "Provisions, Navy," in the naval appropriation act.

Enlisted personnel on active duty are allowed a ration or commutation thereof in money, and in their case this allowed ration is balanced against the deduction authorized. Retired enlisted men and men of the fleet reserve transferred thereto after 16 or more years' service, however, are required to defray hospital subsistence charges at the rate of 75 cents per diem, which is deducted from their retired or retainer pay.

It is from the necessity of thus further contributing to the hospital fund that the bill H. R. 10662 is designed to relieve them.

I think the merit of this bill can be readily appreciated when it is realized that the average retired pay of those whom the bill seeks to benefit amounts to only \$784.84 per annum; also, that it is an injustice to make any deduction from this small amount for rations when confined in a Government hospital. While I realize that at the present time objection is being made to the bill, yet I am hopeful that a further consideration will be given to it by those objecting, to the end that it may receive favorable action at a subsequent day.

Mr. EVANS of California. The reservists who will be benefited by this legislation have been paying into this fund 20 cents per month for 20 years, and it is for the purpose of enabling them to receive the benefit from this fund which they created themselves, that this legislation is proposed.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### PAYMENT OF DEATH GRATUITY—FLEET NAVAL RESERVE AND FLEET MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10674) authorizing payment of six months' death gratuity to beneficiaries of transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who died while on active duty.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understand that there are about 300 of these men in the reserve, employed as ship keepers on laid-up ships. All are on active duty.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the gentleman is approximately correct.

Mr. COLLINS. I have no objection to the bill, providing the gentleman will eliminate the two provisos on page 2.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the retroactive feature should be eliminated, and in view of the policy the committee has adopted to-day to leave the discretion in the Accounting Office, I am willing to accept those two amendments.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is the reason I reserved the objection. It is understood that an amendment striking out the proviso will not be resisted and will be accepted, and that the withdrawal of the reservation is made on that stipulation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is. I will move to strike out the two provisos, and ask the committee to concur in the motion.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the withdrawal of the reservation is under that agreement?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Exactly.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this present bill is also one that I introduced while a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I have no objection to the elimination of that retroactive feature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the provisions of the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, which authorized the payment of an amount equal to six months' pay to the beneficiaries of personnel of the regular Navy or Marine Corps, and retired personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, when on active duty, shall be extended to transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who die while on active duty and not as a result of their own misconduct, and transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall be required to file with the Navy Department the name of beneficiary other than wife or child to which payment of the amount equal to six months' pay shall be made in the event of their death while on active duty and not the result of their own misconduct: *Provided*, That the determination of the fact of dependency in all cases of dependent relatives, of personnel of the Fleet Naval Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, whether previously designated or not, by the Secretary of the Navy, shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government: *Provided further*, That this act shall be retroactive to June 4, 1920.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 2, line 6, strike out the colon, insert a period, and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to and the bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### INQUIRIES CONCERNING REGISTERED MAIL, ETC.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5659) to authorize the Postmaster General to charge a fee for inquiries made for patrons concerning registered, insured, or collect-on-delivery mail, and for postal money orders.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I object.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAPES). Three objections are noted, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

#### TIME FOR SOLDIERS, SAILORS, ETC., TO ENTER PUBLIC LANDS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 181) to amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry," approved February 14, 1920, as amended January 21, 1922, and as extended December 28, 1922.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on page 2, lines 9 and 10, are the words "any war, military occupation, or military expedition." If the gentleman in charge of the bill will agree to strike out "military occupation or military expedition," and will also agree to strike out the pro-

viso beginning with the colon in line 17, I shall have no objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. SWING. Does the gentleman state that if those are not stricken out he will object?

Mr. COLLINS. I do.

Mr. SWING. Then I will agree to have them stricken out.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not get the purport of the amendment.

Mr. COLLINS. The bill has added military occupation or military expedition. Heretofore these ex-soldiers have been soldiers or sailors of a war. Now it is proposed to add "military occupation or military expedition."

Mr. SWING. Those words will add about one half of 1 per cent to the total number of citizens who will be benefited by the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that he is not going to find a soldier in the Regular Army who is desirous of taking the benefit of this. This means real work.

Mr. COLLINS. I do not think we ought to begin that practice at this late day. The second objection undertakes to state that the war with Spain includes the period from April 21, 1898, to July 4, 1902.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That takes in the Philippine insurrection.

Mr. SWING. That is what it is intended to cover. It was put in at the request of the representatives of the Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They were citizen soldiers; they were not professional soldiers at that time.

Mr. COLLINS. If they were soldiers in the war, you do not need this language.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The war was declared at an end and we were then not engaged in warfare with any country. We had taken over the Philippines, but the Philippine insurrection, for the purposes of legislation, has always been included in the war with Spain.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The bill was introduced at the request of the Spanish-American War veterans' organization and that proviso was placed in it.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman accept the amendments I propose?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Is the gentleman going to object unless we do?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Then I accept the amendments, but express the hope the language will be restored in the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry," approved February 14, 1920, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter, for the period of 10 years following the passage of this joint resolution, on the opening of public or Indian lands to entry, or the restoration to entry of public lands theretofore withdrawn from entry, such opening or restoration shall, in the order therefor, provide for a period of not less than 90 days before the general opening of such lands to disposal in which officers, soldiers, sailors, or marines who have served in the Army or Navy of the United States in the war with Germany and been honorably separated or discharged therefrom or placed in the Regular Army or Naval Reserve shall have a preferred right of entry under the homestead or desert land laws, if qualified thereunder, except as against prior existing valid settlement rights and as against preference rights conferred by existing laws or equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation: *Provided further,* That the rights and benefits conferred by this joint resolution shall not extend to any person who, having been drafted for service under the provisions of the selective service act, shall have refused to render such service or to wear the uniform of such service of the United States."

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make any and all regulations necessary to carry into full force and effect the provisions hereof.

With committee amendments as follows:

On page 1, line 5, after the figures "1920," insert "as amended by joint resolution approved January 21, 1922, and as extended by joint resolution approved December 28, 1922."

On page 2, line 1, after the word "following," strike out "the passage of this joint resolution" and insert "February 14, 1930."

On page 2, line 9, strike out "the war with Germany" and insert "any war, military occupation, or military expedition."

On page 2, line 17, after the word "confirmation," insert "*Provided,* That for the purposes of this resolution, the war with Spain shall be considered to include the period from April 21, 1898, to July 4, 1902: *Provided further,* That the same preference rights are hereby extended to apply to those citizens of the United States who served with the allied armies during the World War and who were honorably discharged, upon their resumption of citizenship in the United States, provided the service with the allied armies shall be similar to the service with the Army of the United States for which recognition is granted in this joint resolution."

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment to the committee amendments, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLLINS to the committee amendment: Strike out, in line 10, the words "military occupation or military expedition," and on line 17 strike out "*Provided,* That for the purposes of this resolution the war with Spain shall be considered to include the period from April 21, 1898, to July 4, 1902."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendments.

The amendment to the committee amendments was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments as amended.

The committee amendments as amended were agreed to.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, since the proviso is stricken out it is proper to strike out the word "*further,*" after the word "*Provided,*" on line 20. I move that the word "*further,*" be stricken out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, after the word "States," on line 7, insert: "*Provided,* That the lands known as the Oregon-California land grants shall be subject to said entry, and when filed on the same shall be exempt from taxation by the counties where the same are located."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order on that as not being germane.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that in making an investigation at one of the departments a few days ago I found that this land, although public land and subject to homestead entry, is now being assessed for taxation by various counties in Oregon and possibly one county in California, and that the amount of taxes collected up to the present time is more than \$7,000,000. In other words, the Government is being unjustly penalized because of a law that was passed which was not understood by many Members of Congress, and I think it is time that the matter was brought to the attention of this body.

I am told that a portion of this land was reserved by the Government in order that the same might be used for watersheds in connection with the water supply of some cities in this area. An opinion was written exempting same from assessment, but the Attorney General overruled the opinion, and this portion is not subject to homestead entry unless my amendment should be adopted. Yet the counties are allowed to assess such areas up to as high as \$100 per acre, and the Treasury has to pay on this basis.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman believe that that is a proper amendment to the bill before the House?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is not at all germane to this bill.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I was told that this was a bill that gave preference rights to certain persons who performed services in our military operations and gave them a right to make homestead entries; therefore it would seem that my amendment would be germane.

Mr. CRAMTON. The general subject of the public-land system is not before the House. This is a proposition as to the rights of soldiers and sailors to homestead entry. That is what is before the House. The gentleman brings in something which, though it has to do with the public lands, has nothing at all to do with the rights of soldiers and sailors in homestead entries. I make a point of order on the amendment.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California renew his point of order?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I wanted to conclude a sentence. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I know that a certain portion of this public land has been reserved for certain purposes. I wanted to make these reserves eligible for homestead entry. If what I have offered is not germane to the subject then I am willing that it should go out on a point of order.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, I insist on the point of order.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. I will withhold the point of order.

Mr. COLTON. An amendment is unnecessary. This law will be applicable to these lands.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] is recognized.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a point of order is made against the amendment offered by me on the ground that it is not germane to the bill now under consideration.

I assert that the land I refer to is public land, and public lands, unless there are certain restrictions levied against them, are subject to homestead entry. I have been advised that a portion of this particular area has been withdrawn in order that it might furnish ample protection to certain reservoir systems that now supply cities in that particular area. Therefore I offered the amendment in order that these public lands which now have a temporary withdrawal order levied against them might be eligible for homestead entry, thereby giving to those who are named as a favored class in this legislation the right to make a filing without being bothered by some existing regulation that might prevent them from exercising such a right. I desire that this legislative body should adopt an amendment that would say to this favored class that they have a right to make homestead entry on the lands in this particular area. I have been confidentially advised that President Coolidge, when he signed the bill giving certain counties the right to assess these lands for taxation, did not have any conception of the amount of money that this Government would have to pay in carrying out the provisions of the law. When it is known that they can be homesteaded and paid for at a rate of approximately \$1.25 per acre, and the county authorities are assessing them as high as \$100 per acre, Members of Congress should realize that such favoritism in the way of legislation is not ethical or right. Therefore I am offering this amendment, believing the same to be germane, with the hope that this cruel method of taxing the people of the United States for the purpose of supporting certain counties in Oregon will soon be brought to an end.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma is not germane to this legislation, and therefore sustains the point of order.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to amend a joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry,' approved February 14, 1920, as amended January 21, 1922, and as extended December 28, 1922."

#### NATIONAL CONVENTION, AMERICAN LEGION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10118), to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the Twelfth National Convention of the American Legion, at Boston, Mass., during the month of October, 1930.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized to lend, at his discretion, to the American Legion 1930 Convention Corporation, for use at the Twelfth National Convention of the American Legion to be held at Boston, Mass., in the month of October, 1930, 15,000 cots, 30,000 blankets, 30,000 bed sheets, 15,000 pillows, 15,000 pillowcases, and 15,000 mattresses or bed sacks: *Provided*, That

no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property, the same to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of the said convention as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and the American Legion 1930 Convention Corporation, through the director of housing of the American Legion 1930 Convention Corporation, Raymond O. Brackett: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War, before delivering said property, shall take from the said American Legion 1930 Convention Corporation a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of said property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### POST-OFFICE SITE, AKRON, OHIO

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3246) to authorize the sale of the Government property acquired for a post-office site in Akron, Ohio.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there does not seem to be any provision as to the minimum amount for which the remaining property is to be sold. In the original act of March 4, 1913, it was provided that the building and site should not be sold for any sum less than \$100,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, this bill, it will be noticed, provides that the remainder of the site will be sold upon the terms and conditions provided in the act of Congress of 1913. Hence, under that restriction, the remainder must be sold for at least the amount named in the original act, notwithstanding the small portion that has been diverted to street use.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That was my construction, but I wanted to make it clear that that was the intent of the bill; that it refers back to the act of 1913 and to the conditions there imposed.

Mr. CRAMTON. That would seem to be quite clear.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, has the Post Office Department decided they would not build a new Federal building in Akron?

Mr. CRAMTON. The act of 1913 definitely provided for the sale of this site. The only question involved in the bill that is now before the House is whether a small portion of the old site may be used for street purposes. Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING] could explain it.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Answering the gentleman from Wisconsin, we have a new post office. This bill provides for the sale of the old site.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. But, if this bill is passed, will the site be sold to the public under competitive bids, or will it be a one-man transaction, such as these scandalous post-office leases we have recently found in the Post Office Department.

Mr. SEIBERLING. It will be sold in accordance with the law.

Mr. CRAMTON. It provides for advertisement; either public or private sale, after proper advertisement, under the existing law. The bill before the House only relates to the use of a small part of the property for a street.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to dispose of the Government property acquired for a post-office site at Akron, Ohio, located on the southeast corner of East Market and South High Streets, in the following manner: To transfer by the usual quitclaim deed to the city of Akron for the purpose of widening said East Market Street the northerly portion of said site, beginning at the intersection of the southerly line of East Market Street (between South Main and South High Streets) extended easterly with the eastern line of South High Street; thence with the eastern line of South High Street north 18° 25' east, 11.20 feet, to the southern line of East Market Street; thence with the southern line of East Market Street south 66° 13' east, 133.77 feet, to the western line of Wheeler Lane Alley; thence with the western line of Wheeler Lane Alley south 18° 21' west, 10.18 feet; thence north 60° 43' west, 63.04 feet; thence north 71° 54' west, 71.28 feet, to the place of beginning; and to sell the remainder of the site upon the terms and conditions provided in the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913, authorizing the sale of the above old post-office property in Akron, Ohio.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FACILITIES FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10416) to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill introduces an entirely new policy in the method of constructing buildings by the departments. It gives a sort of blanket authority to the Secretary of Labor to erect buildings—small buildings, it is true—when, in his discretion, they are necessary, and to take the money out of the general appropriation fund. The next bill on the calendar provides the proper way of authorizing the construction of a building. I do not believe we should establish this policy and custom because, although small buildings are involved in this instance, such a policy and custom may grow into something very important.

Mr. CRAMTON. The precedent is not as serious as my friend conceives it to be. This permits funds to be expended from an appropriation for the general maintenance and operation of the Customs and Immigration Services, respectively, and for the acquisition of land and the erection of buildings, the expenditure for any one site, land and building, not to exceed \$3,000, unless it serves both services, when the limit would be \$6,000, of which, I suppose, part would come from the appropriation of one service and part from the appropriation of the other service.

This has to do with rather remote places, where some accommodations are necessary. Of course, it would not be at important points. Congress would not want to be disturbed by passing legislation each time they wanted to put up a \$3,000 building, including the cost of the site. If we did do that, it would probably result in raising the price demanded for the land because there had been some definite action of Congress upon it. As a matter of fact, we do this same thing, in effect, in many branches of the public service. I have in mind that in the item for the conduct of education in the Indian Service it is provided that a certain amount of the sum appropriated may be used for a purpose like this. I think the amount is \$2,500, or something like that. If the amount necessary is more than that, then there must be the specific approval of Congress.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Are they portable schools?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; they are small structures.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We appropriate for the erection of small structures for the Lighthouse Service and other departments.

Mr. CRAMTON. But not for items as small as \$3,000, including the site. Then, the gentleman must understand that the Customs and Immigration Services are facing special emergencies these days, and the setting up of new headquarters here and there on the borders is sometimes rather essential and urgent.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Does the gentleman know of any reason why this item should not come in the regular way in the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not think it would be in order. I would not want to say offhand, because I am not familiar with existing law, but I am rather inclined to assume that the thought of the department was that this would be of a legislative character, and if it were included in an appropriation bill it might be subject to a point of order. As a matter of fact, the expenditure would be supervised each year in connection with the appropriation bill.

Mr. GREENWOOD. If this bill should pass, then it would come in the regular way if they should make a recommendation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. When an appropriation for this purpose is requested there would naturally be a set-up indicating how many of these buildings are to be put up and how much they would cost. However, I will admit this: The appropriations for the fiscal year 1931 have gone through the House, both as to the Labor Department and as to the Treasury Department. This bill would authorize them to use some part of that in the fiscal year 1931 for these purposes without any further action by Congress.

Mr. GREENWOOD. It occurred to me it would be unnecessary and would cause annoyance to have the departments come in with these small items, and that it might be better to have a general law covering propositions of this kind.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the next thing we know they will be putting up post-office buildings.

Mr. CRAMTON. The protection here is the limitation as to the amount.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Would the gentleman object to this: On page 1, line 4, after the word "points," insert the words

"along the Canadian and Mexican borders." I want to narrow it as much as I can.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say that I am a sort of pinch hitter here. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT], who fully understands the measure, was here earlier in the afternoon, but was called away. I promised to do what I could to explain the measure. I do not think an amendment of that kind would be an injury.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to narrow it so there will be no abuse of the authority.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not in authority, but I would not object to the amendment.

Mr. JENKINS. Here would be the trouble about that. As a member of the Committee on Immigration I have had some experience with the matter. These Customs and Immigration Service men are what we call the border patrol, but they do not operate altogether on the border. Sometimes they operate as far back as 200 miles from the border, and I think the main reason for this legislation is that they want to establish certain headquarters. For instance, I was on the Mexican border last year and met the border patrol there. They wanted to build a radio station out there in the mountains, and they wanted to make provision for it. This would have been a very great help to the border patrol and would not have cost much, and, of course, it would not have been on any permanent roadway.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will say to the gentleman that I have lived through the old pork-barrel days of appropriating for public buildings. I was on the Committee on Public Buildings when we brought in the bill which changed our whole system, and I think it is a great improvement, although there may be dissatisfaction here and there. I do not want to destroy that system by allowing a harmless bill to creep in, if you please, that may mean the establishment of a new policy.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman would be satisfied if the amendment is agreed to?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think with a limitation on the amount and a limitation with respect to the locality, it would be all right.

Mr. CRAMTON. If that will get the bill by, I think it will be quite satisfactory.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the opinion of the gentleman from Michigan as to the authority conferred by the proviso. The language is that the total amount which may be expended from any one appropriation shall not exceed \$3,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; for any one project.

Mr. STAFFORD (reading):

That the total amount which may be expended from any one appropriation for any one project.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. That might mean that from one appropriation for one year they may expend \$3,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. I see what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman think that should be eliminated?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; what they mean is this: They are treating of two services in two departments, Customs and Immigration, in Treasury and Labor and the language following provides that where it is from two appropriations, that is, appropriations for the two departments, it can be \$6,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no criticism as to the latter language, but as to the former language it is susceptible of the construction that the limitation only applies to one appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. What would the gentleman suggest, from the appropriation of one department?

Mr. STAFFORD (reading):

That the total amount which may be expended for any one project, including the cost of the site, shall not exceed \$3,000.

This gives full authority, and the language that follows is:

And that where quarters are erected or facilities provided for the joint use of the Customs and Immigration Services the combined cost charged to the two appropriations concerned shall not exceed \$6,000—

And so forth. My thought is to strike out the clause "from any one appropriation." The authority is still there and the limit of cost remains. It is not intended, I presume, to have the same amount taken from successive appropriations, but it seems to me the language would bear that construction.

Mr. CRAMTON. Suppose we strike out the language and after the word "construct," put in "for the use of the department."

Mr. STAFFORD. That is all right.

Mr. CRAMTON. That would clarify it.



Mr. STAFFORD. Now, one further suggestion, in reading the report I noted they wished authority at one time to have considered the buying of a piece of land with a building on it. The language restricts them merely to the acquisition of land.

Mr. CRAMTON. Where is the language that requires that?

Mr. STAFFORD. For instance, beginning at line 10, page 1, and continuing, "the necessary amounts for the acquisition of land." I would suggest there "and appurtenances, if any."

Mr. CRAMTON. I think that is included now, but I would not object to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think that might be included now, but a technical construction might be otherwise.

Mr. CRAMTON. If you buy the land, you get whatever is attached to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. That would be true if it were not for the following language which is, "and the erection of buildings, sheds, and office quarters," and so forth. For this reason I think it would be necessary to put in the qualifying phrase, "and appurtenances, if any."

Mr. CRAMTON. That would be agreeable.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the proponents of this bill to explain why we should pass a bill with the sky the limit, practically authorizing appropriations of hundreds of thousands of dollars, without any consideration by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, this does not increase the appropriations, it widens their availability. In the report signed jointly by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, Secretary Mellon and Secretary Davis—and I think the gentleman will agree that whatever these gentlemen agree on these days we ought to think is probably all right—in their joint report—

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman that while I may agree with these two Cabinet officers, in the future we may have a man in the Cabinet who is just about as responsible, when it comes to the taxpayer's money as a former member of the Cabinet has been with respect to post-office building leases.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me say to the gentleman, he did not get my remark. These two Cabinet officers agree on the necessity, and they make this statement:

The highways at these points are not permanently improved, nor is there definite assurance that the present locations of the roads will be maintained when improvement is finally made. It would, therefore, be unwise to expend considerable sums of Government funds to provide buildings for office purposes and living quarters at these points. The existing conditions, however, are deplorable and the facilities inadequate. Such situations could be remedied inexpensively if the respective appropriations for the Customs and Immigration Services were available for constructing modest but neat and comfortable offices and living quarters.

The sites in such localities could often be obtained without expense and in all cases at a nominal cost.

If this bill passes it will not authorize any new appropriation. It simply authorizes the use of the appropriations available and Congress always has an opportunity to review them.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Available for construction or available for salaries and for other purposes?

Mr. CRAMTON. They will necessarily be restricted, because other demands on these appropriations are so pressing all the time.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the same buildings be used as an arsenal to house shotguns of Federal agents who are waging war against violators of the prohibition law?

Mr. CRAMTON. They might use one as a kind of fortress of defense against well-armed rum runners, but the report does not mention it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. It is clear that the necessity for this bill shows that it is another extraordinary expense put on the taxpayers as the result of prohibition. I shall not object. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, it is understood that I shall offer an amendment which will not be resisted?

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman from New York will make it clear—I do not want to agree to an amendment that could be construed as meaning that the building must be exactly on the border line. If it is to be construed simply as having to do with enforcement on the border that is all right.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is understood that it means along the Canadian and Mexican borders—that it means the border service—anywhere within the area of the border service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws at points where no Federal buildings are available or buildings adapted or suitably located for the purpose are available for rental, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor are hereby authorized to expend from the funds appropriated for the general maintenance and operation of the Customs and Immigration Services, respectively, the necessary amounts for the acquisition of land and the erection of buildings, sheds, and office quarters, including living quarters for officers where none are otherwise available: *Provided*, That the total amount which may be expended from any one appropriation for any one project, including the cost of the site, shall not exceed \$3,000, and that where quarters are erected or facilities provided for the joint use of the Customs and Immigration Services the combined cost charged to the two appropriations concerned shall not exceed \$6,000 for any one project, including the site.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "points," insert "along the Canadian and Mexican borders."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I think if the gentleman will insert that after the word "laws" in the same line it will be a little clearer.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will modify my amendment to that extent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "laws," insert "along the Canadian and Mexican borders."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out the words "from any one appropriation," and after the word "project," in line 5, insert "for the use of one department."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDING FOR RADIO RESEARCH INVESTIGATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10652) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to purchase land and to construct buildings and facilities suitable for radio research investigation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, the report does not give any information as to what is being done in the way of radio research by universities. I know there is considerable research work being undertaken by certain of our larger universities. In fact the Navy Department is sending to certain universities their advanced students, members of the Signal Corps, or what corresponds to that service if in the Army, to take advanced studies. I have read the report rather carefully, and I had difficulty in seeing why we should establish special centers for this work away from the Bureau of Standards.

There is some argument made, it is true, as to the need of these investigational studies in radio broadcasting free from electrical and other disturbances, but what possesses me mostly is that there is no showing here that it is necessary to have this work undertaken under the auspices of the Bureau of Standards. I am especially interested in learning whether it is necessary to have the Bureau of Standards to undertake this work if similar studies are being undertaken by private establishments. As this involves considerable expense, I ask unanimous consent, as the gentleman from Indiana is not present to explain the real purposes of the bill, that it may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7585) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of

rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is merely an authorization for an appropriation?

Mr. COLTON. This amends the basic law. It is a little more than an authorization bill. There would have to be an authorization bill passed later. This amends the law of July 11, 1916, and would make it possible for an authorization bill to follow.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But you would have to come here for an authorization bill?

Mr. COLTON. Yes. That is as I understand the situation.

Mr. CRAMTON. What does the gentleman mean by an authorization bill?

Mr. COLTON. Take as an illustration the Dowell bill. The Dowell bill is bottomed on the same legislation that this bill seeks to amend, and yet each two years we bring in an authorization bill for an appropriation. If we follow that precedent, we would pass an authorization bill.

Mr. COLLINS. This bill, as I understand it, simply permits these public-land States to get an additional sum of money other than that they now get under the regular road appropriation bill. Under present law in determining the amount that these States receive, the extent of public land is considered, but this bill will enable these States to get an additional sum of money.

Mr. COLTON. Yes. We are working, of course, as the gentleman knows—

Mr. COLLINS. To get more.

Mr. COLTON. On a general road-building program in the United States, and as is the case with forest reserves, there are tracts of land owned by the Government of the United States that are not within forests across which we need to build connecting links, and this would authorize the Congress in the future to make special appropriations to take care of those cases in the public-land States where, under existing conditions, roads on the Federal-aid system can not be built. It would enable us to do on a smaller scale what we are doing in the national forests.

Mr. COLLINS. When the authorization bill was enacted, all of these things about which the gentleman speaks were considered.

Mr. COLTON. So far as I am informed, the hearings do not so disclose. There was an attempt only to provide for a general system of Federal-aid roads and to appropriate for that Federal-aid system in a general way, and also for the forests' highways, but no special consideration given to the roads on the public domain. No provision has ever been made for them. Yet there are many places where help is imperative if we are ever to have a completed road system.

Mr. COLLINS. The result of the passage of this bill would be to give these particular States all that they ordinarily get out of general road appropriations and in addition this added amount.

Mr. COLTON. Whatever Congress should see fit to appropriate to build roads across the Government land would, of course, be added.

Mr. COLLINS. And at the present time you can not get what you would get if this bill should pass?

Mr. COLTON. No; and we can not get roads that form connecting links on the public domain without special appropriations.

Mr. COLLINS. And if this bill should be agreed to, what would it cost to build the roads through these States?

Mr. COLTON. It is understood that we would ask for perhaps two or three million dollars for three years, until some of the absolutely necessary links in Federal-aid roads are constructed.

Mr. COLLINS. Thirty million dollars has been suggested to me.

Mr. COLTON. Oh, no such amounts are contemplated. I say two or three million dollars for a period of two or three years, and not to exceed nine or ten millions. Two years ago Congress passed a special authorization act authorizing three and a half million dollars for three years, or a total of ten and a half million dollars for this purpose. The bill passed both Houses but was vetoed by the President.

Mr. COLLINS. And this is the same bill?

Mr. COLTON. No.

Mr. COLLINS. Or practically the same bill that Mr. Coolidge vetoed?

Mr. COLTON. No. That was a special appropriation bill. This bill would amend the basic law and enable Congress to pass special appropriation bills as the circumstances justified. This legislation has been indorsed by the National Association of Highway Officials and by many other associations all over the

country which are interested in securing good roads. There is no other way of raising the money to build the roads across the Government land except for Congress to appropriate.

Mr. COLLINS. I much prefer an authorization, so that Congress can know the outside figure to be expended.

Mr. CRAMTON. The other bill that was vetoed by President Coolidge I thought I could unders and, but I am at rather a loss on this one. It provides, first:

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the State highway departments and with the Department of the Interior in the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations other than the forest reservations.

I do not understand that the Department of Agriculture cooperates with State authorities in maintaining roads now in Federal highway systems. That would be a new departure there, would it not?

Mr. COLTON. They cooperate in maintaining forest roads, but not on the Federal-aid system of roads outside the national forests.

Mr. CRAMTON. But on this they do cooperate?

Mr. COLTON. Yes. They would cooperate until there was some other way of maintaining the roads.

Mr. CRAMTON. That first sentence is based purely on a question of cooperation between the Federal and the State Governments. Then the bill provides:

Such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize to be expended under the provisions of this section shall be apportioned among those States having more than 5 per cent of their area in the lands hereinbefore described and shall be prorated and apportioned to said States in the proportion that said lands in each of said States is to the total area of said lands in the States eligible under the provisions of this section, and no contribution from the States shall be required in the expenditure thereof.

That would seem to mean that when Congress passes the agricultural appropriation bill at this Congress with \$125,000,000 for the fiscal year 1931, under this authority a portion of that \$125,000,000—and the bill has not yet passed the House and Senate but is in conference and will not become a law inside of several weeks—would be available for the construction of roads across these lands without State cooperation.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. CRAMTON. Because the language is not "such sums as Congress may hereafter authorize to be appropriated," but "such sums as Congress may hereafter authorize to be expended." When we pass an appropriation bill we authorize the expenditure of that money, and hence any road item in an appropriation bill that becomes a law after this bill becomes a law would be available for the construction of these roads.

Mr. COLTON. There was no intention of doing that. I am willing to change that language so as to provide that, "such sums as Congress shall hereafter authorize to be appropriated," shall be substituted for the language just read. There is no intention to divert any of the \$125,000,000 to this special purpose. There are connecting links in our Federal-aid system that cross large areas of public domain, where there is no privately owned property at all, nothing to be taxed. We want help for such areas.

It is an impossibility to build roads in some sections now.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say to the gentleman from Utah that I am in thorough sympathy with what he is trying to do. I have been through those regions where the Government owns all the land, with nothing taxable. I think the Government, if it is going to have a national system of highways, needs to connect them up across its own property, and I would like to see the bill, if it goes through, made clear enough and extensive enough to accomplish what is wanted. The first sentence authorizes the department to cooperate. The second sentence says the money shall be apportioned among the States—

And no contribution from the States shall be required in the expenditure thereof.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman will realize that in most of the States the money for building roads is raised by taxation in the counties, and the counties are the units. There are large areas of land where there is no taxable property, and if we made it on the basis of cooperation we would get nowhere in building the roads to which I am referring.

Mr. CRAMTON. But there is a conflict between those two sentences.

Further, a later sentence reads:

The roads constructed and maintained under the provisions of this section shall be of the same standard as to width and character of construction as the Federal Government requires of the States under like conditions.



This is a question that I went into a couple of years ago with Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Hughes, of the Bureau of Public Roads. In fact, I met them when they were making a study of this very problem in New Mexico. At that time Mr. MacDonald had come to the conclusion—and so far as I know he still holds to that belief—that a great deal of good could be done by building not the sort of paved highways that we require of the States in connected highways, roads that run into large amounts of money, but roads that would be sufficient to take care of the traffic that is calling for them; and it would seem to me that this sentence to which I have called attention would be contrary to the belief of Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would not this requirement also compel the service to make the same width of road going over the mountains, which would be very expensive?

Mr. CRAMTON. You take the Navajo country and other Indian reservations. There is no occasion there for a paved highway. Your money would not last long enough if you made the highways to cover those areas.

Mr. COLTON. In none of these places are they building even a paved highway. The most we hope to get is a gravel road.

Mr. CRAMTON. What is the minimum standard that the Government requires in the expenditures of Federal funds in cooperation with the States? They are higher, in my opinion, than the standard Mr. MacDonald has in mind here.

Mr. COLTON. I think those standards vary. I do not think you could state exactly what they are in all cases. They vary.

Mr. MacDonald, the Director of the Bureau of Public Roads, has heartily indorsed this bill. He came before the committee and urged the passage of the bill. The only reason for this measure is that if we are building through a section—and I may say that the gentleman must not get the impression that our States are not building roads, even across Government lands, because we are building many roads across Government-owned land—the only reason I say is simply to take care of instances where we can not raise money for building the type of roads absolutely needed and recommended by the Bureau of Public Roads without Government aid. Where these connecting links are built they should be built to the same standard as the approaching roads, in order that they may carry the same traffic.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, my objection to this bill was as to the distribution of funds. My understanding is that the Bureau of Public Roads has a restriction on the spending of the money to places where the department believes it should be spent. But under this bill you will allocate the funds in the public domain.

Mr. COLTON. I would rather leave the discretion in the Bureau of Public Roads in accordance with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. We make the allocation of the funds to the various States, and after they are allocated the department should use its discretion in cooperation with the States in deciding upon particular places for its use. The allotments are made on the ratio of the publicly owned land to the privately owned lands within each State.

Mr. GREENWOOD. How is it allocated?

Mr. COLTON. It is allocated by the Department of Agriculture on the basis of the public domain within the various States, if that is what the gentleman means. Of course, the original allocation is made under the provisions of the basic road act, but the per cent of participation by the Federal Government is determined by the amount of public lands.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Is it the purpose to base it on the proportion of the Government-owned land in the public-land States?

Mr. COLTON. Yes; the participation by the Government is on that basis.

No doubt it would give a larger assignment to that State where it is absolutely needed, than to some State where not so much was needed.

Mr. GREENWOOD. But they are held down to a percentage basis. They have no discretion now in distributing the fund, except on a fixed percentage basis.

Mr. COLTON. No. It is exactly the same as under the provisions of the forest act.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is it not a fact that this greatly extends our maintenance obligation?

Mr. COLTON. It extends it to that part that we would build on the public domain until there is some method of maintaining the roads; yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, we will assume permanently, as long as these are Federal lands, the maintenance as well as the construction. I have the impression that the Colton bill, which was passed by the House, provided for State maintenance.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] asks unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### REIMBURSABLE CHARGES AGAINST INDIAN TRIBES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10879) directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate reimbursable charges against Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this subject is one of very great importance in which the department has already a very large amount of authority. There is nothing to prevent the department studying this question, and using funds now available, and making such recommendations as they desire. Not only that, but considerable has been done with reference to this subject. In the last two or three years I have been somewhat responsible for wiping off the slate certain charges that were put on the books as reimbursable charges. They have just reorganized the bureau. The commissioner and assistant commissioner are new men of good ability and high ideals. They are trying to familiarize themselves with conditions. I think it will be better to let them have a little time to get familiar with conditions before thrusting upon them heavy new burdens.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. As I understand the gentleman's position, this is work which should be done, but—

Mr. CRAMTON. But should be done properly.

Mr. LEAVITT. But which does not require this particular piece of legislation?

Mr. CRAMTON. Legislation no doubt would be required before the job is completed. But legislation is not required to authorize the department to make the study and funds are not required.

Mr. LEAVITT. But the department states, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs states, that they do require some additional funds in order to make the study of the reclamation projects on the Indian reservations.

Mr. CRAMTON. My thought is that they have no need for \$50,000, and I do not believe it is desirable to go out with a brass band and try to organize a demand for wiping charges off the slate. I would like to see it done in some kind of a judicial spirit, without regard to local demands that may be aroused through the passage of this bill.

Mr. LEAVITT. Of course, the purpose of this bill, in the mind of the Committee on Indian Affairs, is to meet one of the most fundamental problems in solving the entire Indian question. It is to make possible the adjustment of some of these charges that exist against Indian tribes from long times in the past and which are hampering their advancement.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think something should be done.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Why could we not wipe them off the books?

Mr. CRAMTON. The new Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs have been identified with organizations which had high ideals and theories but not in touch with facts. They are going into the field, as they have an opportunity, to study conditions. In six months or a year they will be much better able to judge of those conditions. I believe they have enough troubles without thrusting this burden precipitately upon them.

Mr. LEAVITT. In reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], I introduced a bill about a year ago that would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, on his own investigation, to wipe out charges that are unjustly standing against Indian tribes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And these are old, uncollected charges?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes. On one Indian reservation years ago, by authority of Congress, an irrigation ditch was built and a wooden flume. The Indians were not taught how to use the water. The wooden flume has fallen down for many years, and still the cost of that project rests against that Indian tribe. We are at this time trying to get lands allotted to them and bring them closer to being self-supporting, but when it comes to a question of funds to enable them to do this which is now constructively necessary we find these old charges, in that case, the reclamation charge. As far as this same tribe is concerned, there is another instance where the Government said to these Indians, "We ought to use your money to buy a herd of cattle"; and then the Government, handling their herd of cattle, lost nearly all of them. Still, the charges are against the Indians.

When the Indians get a little money, using reason, of course, because they do not want to injure the Indians, the authorities take, as opportunity comes, money from those Indians to meet these old charges.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think it is doubtful, Mr. Speaker, whether a dollar has ever been taken to pay off these old charges. Not recently, in any event.

Mr. LEAVITT. I know it has been done.

Mr. CRAMTON. But not in recent years.

Mr. LEAVITT. Congress should authorize the Indian Bureau to wipe out these charges, just as would be the case if the gentleman from Michigan and myself, owing money to a bank, should fall into difficulties, or ill health, or something like that, the bank could adjust that debt with us and give us more time to wipe out some of it; but there is no authority with regard to these debts against the Indians at this time to readjust them and charge them off, and it must be done.

Mr. CRAMTON. But, in the last 10 years, I think I am safe in saying that not one dollar of Indian funds has been used to pay construction irrigation charges.

Mr. LEAVITT. I have received a letter within the last two weeks from a man who owns land in one of these irrigation projects, who got authority and sold some other land thinking it would enable him to plant his crops and help educate his children, and he found that that entire amount, or much of it, had been taken to pay off some accumulated water charges on other lands that he owned, under an irrigation project.

Mr. CRAMTON. Was he a restricted Indian?

Mr. LEAVITT. He is a restricted Indian or they could not handle his funds.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, that is something new to me. Year after year we go over all of these Indian irrigation projects and we find the amount that has been expended for construction and that nothing is being collected. We have not urged that there ought to be any collections. I think it is desirable that there be a study of these things. There is ample authority of law for them to make the study and there is no limit of the authority to make appropriations. If this bill passes, then they can spend \$50,000, and after that they can not spend anything.

Mr. LEAVITT. This \$50,000 is merely to pay the cost of a careful study, including the services of two men not now a part of the Indian Bureau and who, under the present situation, could not be hired.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is nothing to prevent them from getting the money from the Committee on Appropriations through an appropriation bill, and if anything had been said to our committee showing the need of those two men for that purpose I am sure it would have met the approval of the committee. I am sure there is nothing to prevent them from hiring those men now to make this study.

Mr. LEAVITT. That entirely satisfies me.

Mr. CRAMTON. They have as much right to have those men as they have to have a Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. LEAVITT. If they have the money.

Mr. CRAMTON. If they need money, they should ask for it.

Mr. LEAVITT. I will present the matter in connection with the next deficiency bill, because all I am interested in is not the passage of this bill but to get the study made and these old charges adjusted.

Mr. CRAMTON. However, we are not going to have men appointed who think the Treasury of the United States only exists for the purpose of relieving Indians.

Mr. LEAVITT. There is nothing in this bill which contemplates that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am sure of that, because it is presented by the gentleman from Montana, in whom I have a great deal of confidence. If men are selected who will use good, common horse sense and have some regard for the Treasury of the United States, I think nobody will object to their appointment.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And the gentleman from Michigan says if you will apply for the appropriation you will get it.

Mr. LEAVITT. That is very, very good news to me.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. So that is eliminated. Now, assuming this study is made, has the commissioner or the Secretary of the Interior authority at the present time to wipe off some of these old charges?

Mr. LEAVITT. No, he has not; and this bill would not give it to him.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Then you are all right if you get your appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think I am justified in saying that within the last year or two, through the cooperation of the gentleman from Montana and myself, from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 of

such charges have been wiped off, where the propriety for such action was very clear and recommended by the bureau.

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes. The gentleman from Michigan has been very helpful in that direction. This bill is the result of a proposal made by me along the line of the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, that the Secretary be given authority to adjust these old charges. The department reported that the method in this bill is the better method, but I do not agree with them. I think there should be direct authority to do that.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Well, the gentleman has the direct commitment of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEAVITT. I will state that I am entirely satisfied with to-day's developments in the advancement of this idea.

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course, I can not speak for the committee but am expressing my own views.

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to ask if this bill contemplates an investigation such as is covered in a bill I introduced, authorizing a suit—and which has been indorsed, as I understand, by the Department of the Interior—for the Warm Springs Indians. Does this bill contemplate an investigation of their claims?

Mr. LEAVITT. This bill would authorize and call for an investigation of all outstanding reimbursable charges against Indian tribes, and would appropriate \$50,000 for expenses on the statement of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that that amount is necessary to make the proper investigation of reimbursable charges having to do with reclamation projects on Indian reservations. Then, as the next step it would require that the report of the findings be made to the Congress so that Congress could then take such action as was necessary or justified under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

#### UTAH STATE TREASURER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1601) to authorize the Department of Agriculture to issue two duplicate checks in favor of Utah State treasurer where the originals have been lost.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3646, as amended, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, the disbursing clerk of the Department of Agriculture is authorized and directed to issue, without the requirement of an indemnity bond, a duplicate of original check No. 42772, drawn March 17, 1928, in favor of Utah State treasurer for \$1,066.27 and original check No. 52754, drawn March 17, 1928, in favor of Utah State treasurer for \$21,848.96, and lost, stolen, or miscarried in the mails.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF THE NATIONAL PARKS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8163) to facilitate the administration of the national parks by the United States Department of the Interior, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the bill is one that is very desirable.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Consent Calendar will be reached again within 10 days.

Mr. CRAMTON. As the bill is to be passed over, I would like to make this statement: That the committee has eliminated sections 3 and 11, as I understand. That is upon the theory that those matters are sufficiently taken care of in H. R. 5568, which is now pending. I happen to be the introducer of H. R. 5568, the uniform contract bill, and while I am hopeful it may pass and become law, it has not yet been reported by the committee and no one can guarantee it will become law. Hence it is my suggestion that the committee consider leaving sections 3 and 11 in the bill. Then, of course, if the contract bill does become law, all right; otherwise they would be in and effective.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### CARLSBAD CAVERNS NATIONAL PARK

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9895) to establish the Carlsbad Caverns National Park, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of this bill what is the probable cost and what is the real reason for the enactment of the legislation?

Mr. COLLINS. I am not the author, but I have given some thought to this bill. The Carlsbad Caverns undoubtedly are the greatest caverns in this country and, perhaps, in the whole world. They were discovered, so I understand, in 1900, by a man by the name of Jim White, and were brought to the attention of Dr. George Otis Smith, Director of the Geological Survey, by Hon. Richard F. Burges, of El Paso, Tex., not only one of the great lawyers of this country, but one of our foremost bibliophiles. The interest of this distinguished American in these caverns, without doubt, hastened the Interior Department in making investigations which will ultimately disclose underground scenic beauties not elsewhere to be found.

Mr. SIMMS. Mr. Speaker, it is not contemplated, as I understand, under the terms of the bill to substantially increase the annual outlay for the operation of this natural wonder. It is thought by the Director of the National Park Service and others in authority that the Carlsbad Caverns Monument, as it is now, is of sufficient importance and interest from many standpoints to justify its inclusion among the national parks of the country. It has attracted the favorable attention of hundreds of thousands of people of the country.

Mr. JONES of Texas. If the gentleman will yield I would like to suggest that the folks in my section of the country regard this, as I think it is generally regarded, as the most wonderful thing of its kind in the world. I think the adoption of this measure is thoroughly justified.

Mr. JENKINS. What I am particularly interested in is this: I notice it has been considered heretofore as a national monument. What change is it proposed to make?

Mr. SIMMS. No change in the expenditure of money, simply a change in status to include it among the more important areas of the country.

Mr. COLTON. In other words, this makes of it a national park instead of a national monument.

Mr. LEAVITT. If the gentleman will permit, it was a national monument to begin with because, as a great natural wonder that had been discovered and partly explored, it could be withdrawn by proclamation of the President and preserved during its development. This development has shown it to be what the other gentlemen speaking for the bill have said, one of the greatest natural wonders in the world, and action of Congress is required to give it national park status.

Mr. JENKINS. This carries with it, naturally—

Mr. LEAVITT. No increased appropriation, because it has been developed already on the standard of a national park. The same thing happened, let me add, in connection with the great canyon known as the Grand Canyon of the Colorado. It went through this same process, first presidential proclamation and then an act of Congress creating it a national park.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Is this a part of the public domain at the present time, so it will not be necessary to buy any of the land?

Mr. SIMMS. It is a part of the public domain. It may interest gentlemen to know that the receipts from the park are greater than the annual outlay.

Mr. JENKINS. I am pleased to have that information.

Mr. BRIGGS. As I understand, it is not contemplated to place any heavier burden upon the Government than now obtains in connection with its upkeep?

Mr. SIMMS. Not at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the tract of land heretofore known as the Carlsbad Cave National Monument, in the State of New Mexico, established and designated as a national monument under the act of June 8, 1906, entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," and by presidential proclamation of October 25, 1923, be, and the same is hereby, declared to be a national park and dedicated as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people under the name of

the Carlsbad Caverns National Park, under which name the aforesaid national park shall be entitled to receive and to use all moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the Carlsbad Cave National Monument.

SEC. 2. That the administration, protection, and development of said Carlsbad Caverns National Park shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," and acts supplementary thereto or amendatory thereof.

SEC. 3. That the provisions of the act of June 10, 1920, known as the Federal water power act, shall not apply to or extend over the land hereby or hereafter reserved and dedicated as the Carlsbad Caverns National Park.

SEC. 4. That the boundaries of said Carlsbad Caverns National Park may be enlarged by subsequent proclamation or proclamations of the President upon the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SALE OF TIMBERLAND IN MINNESOTA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9934) providing for the sale of timberland in four townships in the State of Minnesota.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question with reference to the application of existing law. I find on page 2 of the committee report that the commissioner states that:

These lands are subject to sale under section 2455, Revised Statutes, if isolated tracts, at public auction at not less than the appraised price.

Why is it necessary to enact this legislation and provide for closed sale without the public having an opportunity to buy under competitive conditions?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, may I say in reply to the gentleman that an attempt was made by various individuals to buy some of these tracts last fall but the land office at Cass Lake held they were not isolated tracts and would therefore have to be entered as agricultural lands. The purpose of this legislation is to permit the sale of these lands under the same conditions as those carried in the stone and timber act, which would not require residence thereon.

As the gentleman will observe, these lands are to be sold at \$2.50 an acre, and the money is to be paid into the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians in accordance with treaty.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And this is limited to only four townships?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; and I might say further that terming these lands timberlands is erroneous, because they were burnt over very severely last fall; in fact, my best judgment is that all they would be good for now would be for pasturage.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Would the gentleman have any objection to incorporating an amendment inserting the words, "at public sale," after the word "sold," in line 7?

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not know that I would object, but I do not think that would make any material difference. The treaty with the Chippewa Indians provides that these lands shall be sold for \$2.50 an acre, and I can assure the gentleman that is all the lands are worth. I do not see why it should be necessary to hold a public sale. In the first place, it would probably not be possible to dispose of all of them at one time, and under the gentleman's amendment they could only be sold at public sale. Under the language of the bill as it now stands anyone could go to the land office at Cass Lake and buy these lands at any time for \$2.50 an acre. They may sell 40 acres now and 40 acres next month or next year, but if they were compelled to advertise these lands every so often probably they would not be able to get them up for sale more than once or twice and they could not be sold after that were done. Then, too, the cost of advertising would probably consume the total receipts.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Inasmuch as the author of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson], is a chief of the Chippewas and seems to think that the bill without the amendment will produce more revenue for the Chippewas I shall withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That vacant, unappropriated, unreserved lands valued chiefly for timber in townships 158 and 159 north, range 32 west and in townships 158 and 159, range 33 west, fifth principal



meridian, Beltrami County, Minn., in the former Red Lake Indian Reservation, may be sold to citizens of the United States, or to persons who have declared their intention to become such, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, in quantities not exceeding 160 acres to any one person or association of persons, at the appraised value, but in no case less than \$2.50 per acre: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall defeat or impair any bona fide claim under any law of the United States, or authorize the sale of the improvements of any bona fide settler.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FIXING THE SIZE OF FARM UNITS ON DESERT-LAND ENTRIES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1186) to amend section 5 of the act of June 27, 1906, conferring authority upon the Secretary of the Interior to fix the size of farm units on desert-land entries when included within national reclamation projects.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill a question. I notice on page 2 of the bill it provides that certain homestead rights given to people, under certain conditions, are required to relinquish them. From the standpoint of the law against confiscation of property, how can you justify that?

Mr. FRENCH. I am glad to answer the gentleman. The bill refers to lands upon which entries under the desert land act were made before reclamation withdrawal. Following the withdrawal an entryman under the desert land law could go ahead and develop a water system of his own with which to reclaim his land, and thus would not need to come under the reclamation project. On the other hand, should he prefer to come under the general reclamation law and receive the advantages through the development of the reclamation project that other settlers receive, he ought to conform to the conditions imposed on other people who have homesteaded lands or who own private property.

Mr. JENKINS. My idea was that you were going to establish a water system and compel him to give up half of his land.

Mr. FRENCH. No; we do not compel him to unless he prefers the system and wants to come in and develop his land under the same conditions that other people accept, some, even, who own property in fee—

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the proviso to section 5 of the act of June 27, 1906, chapter 3359, Thirty-fourth Statutes, page 520, be amended so as to read as follows:

*"Provided*, That if after investigation the irrigation project has been or may be abandoned by the Government, time for compliance with the desert land law by any such entryman shall begin to run from the date of notice of such abandonment of the project and the restoration to the public domain of the lands withdrawn in connection therewith, and credit shall be allowed for all expenditures and improvements theretofore made on any such desert-land entry of which proof has been or may be filed; but if the reclamation project is carried to completion so as to make available a water supply for the land embraced in any such desert-land entry the entryman shall thereupon comply with all the provisions of the aforesaid act of June 17, 1902, and shall relinquish all land embraced within his desert-land entry in excess of one farm unit, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, and as to such retained farm unit he shall be entitled to make final proof and obtain patent upon compliance with the regulations of said Secretary applicable to the remainder of the irrigable land of the project and with the terms of payment prescribed in said act of June 17, 1902, and not otherwise. But nothing herein contained shall be held to require a desert-land entryman who owns a water right and reclaims the land embraced in his entry to accept the conditions of said reclamation act."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "relinquish," insert "within a reasonable time after notice as the Secretary may prescribe and not less than two years."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### INVESTIGATIONS OF COTTON GINNING

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10173) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations of cotton ginning.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I want to inquire if this study is on the mechanical end of the process, or is it the agricultural study that is contemplated?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is the mechanical process.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Would it not fit better in the Bureau of Standards than in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No, I think not; because \$50,000,000 damages done to the lint cotton produced each year is caused by the gin saws tearing and cutting the staple of the lint cotton all to pieces, greatly decreasing the spinnable value of the staple. In addition to this, the uniformity of the staple is destroyed, both elements of damage resulting in a greater cost to the spinners in manufacturing the lint into cloth and in the production of inferior cloth. You understand the length, strength, and the uniformity of the staple or fiber are three of the most valuable spinnable factors in cotton. These are destroyed by the present ginning process, and the results contemplated by this bill are desired by both the cotton producer and the spinners.

You understand manufacturers of ginning machinery seek to manufacture that which is desired by their customers. Their customers, the ginners, want machinery that will turn out the most lint per hour or per day, as they charge for ginning by the 100 pounds. Thus, no attention has in the past been paid to the proper ginning of cotton with a view of conserving its value as produced in nature. As a result, \$50,000,000 of created wealth is destroyed each year through the ginning process of cotton. The Bureau of Standards have no expert scientists on the length, strength, and uniformity of cotton staple, and no way of determining when it had been damaged, and could not possibly solve the problem.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It seems to me that if this was a research of the mechanical end that it would be better for the Bureau of Standards to do it.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The grading of the staple is done by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the Bureau of Standards carries on practically all of its work in Washington, whereas this would be done necessarily in the field.

Mr. STAFFORD. A very strong point why it should be in the Department of Agriculture is that the work of the Bureau of Standards is confined at their headquarters here, while this work is done in the field in various agricultural States.

Mr. COLLINS. Cotton farmers are greatly interested in the experimental gin plant. There is general complaint that the staple, and frequently the grade of cotton, are greatly injured by present methods of ginning. This is especially true of the public gin.

The bill provides for experiments to improve cotton ginning by the Department of Agriculture. The proper conditions of ginning will be studied and types of machinery will be investigated. The matters of moisture and temperature will be investigated. The purpose is to eliminate the losses now sustained by cotton farmers. It is estimated that the farmers of the South are now losing about \$30,000,000 annually on account of insufficient ginning. A better fiber will result, and the manufacturer and the consumer will be benefited.

The public gin operates too fast, and cotton is frequently gin out as a result of being too green when ginned.

The farmer knows that there is a defect in modern ginning, and the aim of the bill is to ascertain and correct the faults and defects which are quite general. The cotton grower will greatly benefit. The legislation is in aid of agriculture.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If you gentlemen from the cotton region think this is all right, it is satisfactory to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In my district there is a mechanical department of the agricultural college which has an experiment station, and they carry on a bureau of engineering and experimentation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Would the gentleman suggest that we leave it to that establishment to work out, instead of having the Federal Government undertake it?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, certainly not. Agricultural colleges are very essential in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture but are not equipped to solve problems like this one.

Mr. CRAMTON. Would it be agreeable to the gentleman to have section 2 amended and make it "not more than \$100,000," so that the committee handling the appropriation, of which the gentleman from Texas is a member, can decide whether or not as much money as this is necessary?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That will be perfectly satisfactory to me. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.



The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to investigate the ginning of cotton; to establish and maintain experimental ginning plants and laboratories; and to make such tests, demonstrations, and experiments, and such technical and scientific studies in relation to cotton ginning as he shall deem necessary, and to publish the results thereof, with a view to developing improved ginning equipment and encouraging the use of improved methods, and he may cooperate with any department or agency of the Government, any State, Territory, District, or possession, or department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, or any person, as he shall find to be necessary.

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and thereafter such sums as may be necessary.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, line 7, after the word "appropriated," insert the words "not more than."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to estimate the value of the pending legislation to the cotton industry. There is much need for the proposed investigations of cotton ginning. The studies already made by the Department of Agriculture indicate many benefits to cotton growers.

The bill was introduced and fostered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], and I take occasion in this connection to say that the agricultural interests of the Nation, and especially the cotton growers of the South, are indebted to Mr. BUCHANAN for his efficient and effective work as a member of the powerful Committee on Appropriations and as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. He is ever alert to take advantage of any opportunity in behalf of agriculture, and his long experience and comprehensive studies combine to make him an invaluable member of the Committee on Appropriations.

#### DETERIORATION

Largely as a result of his activity, the agricultural appropriation bill of 1928, and subsequent years, contains an annual appropriation of \$10,000 for ginning studies. The bill for the current year also carries an additional \$10,000 for laboratory studies of cotton fibers, and a further item of \$10,000 for the studies of the engineering phases of cotton ginning.

Mr. BUCHANAN is an authority on agricultural legislation, and he is always receptive to any plans to promote the progress of cotton growing and other agricultural pursuits.

Senator PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi, who is always active in behalf of the cotton growers of the South, introduced a companion bill, known as S. 3687, in the Senate, which has been unanimously and favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

As a cotton grower and as a cotton ginner, I have been interested in the improvement of cotton ginning for years. On December 19, 1929, as shown by page 981 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, during the consideration of the current agricultural appropriation bill, I made an argument in support of more adequate appropriations for the investigations of cotton ginning. I am thoroughly familiar with the pending bill and have conferred from time to time during the session with Mr. BUCHANAN, Senator HARRISON, and many other Members of the House and Senate, to promote the legislation, and have had the matter up with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and with the Bureau of Standards. There is cooperation between these two bureaus in improving the standards of cotton ginning. It has been thought best that the investigations should continue to be under the supervision of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, because the problem is primarily an agricultural one.

Cotton is the oldest and most universal of all fibers. It was found in the Western Hemisphere when Columbus discovered America. It is grown on all continents. Generally cultivated, it sometimes grows without cultivation and is known as wild cotton. Cotton was cultivated 800 years before Christ. Separation of the fiber from the seed was first done by hand. This primitive method obtains in remote parts of Africa, India, and China to-day. Machinery now, however, is almost universally used. I can recall the old hand or horse gins. The feeding of the gins by hand and the tramping of the cotton into the press by foot have been succeeded by modern suction saw gins and by hydraulic presses. The hand and the horse have been succeeded by steam, oil, and electricity.

Gins are of two kinds, the roller and the saw types. The roller type of gin was first employed and Egyptian cotton is

now ginned on roller gins. The invention of the saw gin by Eli Whitney in 1792 revolutionized cotton production. The saw gin stands out in contrast to the roller gin and is now generally used in ginning not only short-staple but long-staple cotton. Formerly sea-island cotton was produced in southeastern United States, in the ginning of which roller gins were used. It is believed that ginning of the longer Delta staples would be materially improved by the use of roller gins. All types of ginning will be investigated under the pending bill. Both the brush and the air-blast types of gins will be studied.

There is universal complaint that Delta staples and other long-staple cottons are being seriously injured by improper cotton ginning to-day. Just recently Mr. David R. Coker, of South Carolina, the outstanding cottonseed breeder in the entire country, informed me that he almost despaired of the future of staple-cotton production because of the inability to secure proper ginning. In the fall of 1929 Mr. Coker examined the staple of a certain cotton in the field as it was being harvested and was later greatly disappointed to find that this staple had been materially shortened at the gin. In 1925 two cotton growers in the Mississippi Delta planted the same seed on similar land. The cotton was ginned on different gins. There was a difference of one-sixteenth of an inch in the staple, or one planter lost 3 cents per pound, or \$15 a bale, on his cotton.

The separation of the cotton fiber from the seed by hand results in a very much better staple than the separation by the use of machinery. The hand gin, with its slow processes, gave much better staples than modern gin machinery.

There is a deterioration in long and short cotton as a result of improper ginning. It is a difficult, if not a delicate, process to gin short-staple cotton. It is more difficult to gin long-staple cotton. Inadequate ginning may change a profit in cotton production to a loss.

#### EXPERIMENTS

Improper ginning results in a loss of wealth already created. There is a great economic waste in ginning. The preparation of cotton for the market is frequently neglected by the grower. The cotton gin and the cotton ginner occupy a strategic point in the movement of the cotton from the farm to the factory.

The grade and staple of cotton are influenced by the method of ginning. The cotton merchants and the cotton spinners are complaining that the ginning of American cotton has deteriorated. They assert that the lint is rougher, more gin cut, and more neppy than formerly. They maintain that the fibers are damaged and that the spinning qualities are reduced as a result of improper ginning. There is special complaint that there has been deterioration in the ginning of Delta staple cotton. The Department of Agriculture, as a result of the action of the International Universal Cotton Standards Conference in Washington, D. C., in March, 1929, has established three types or standards for each grade of staple cotton. For instance, there is strict middling, excellent preparation, strict middling, normal preparation, strict middling, fair preparation. The grower is being penalized for inadequate ginning. Cotton is being more carefully graded than heretofore. Standards have been universally adopted. The average annual cotton crop in the United States amounts to approximately 14,500,000 bales. It is conservatively estimated that the cotton growers are losing from three to five dollars a bale annually on account of insufficient and inadequate ginning.

The Department of Agriculture was established to do for the individual what he can not do for himself. It was never the purpose that the Department of Agriculture should engage in business. It is their function to study and investigate and to give the public the benefits of their studies and investigations.

The proposed legislation is peculiarly appropriate. It may be suggested that the manufacturers of ginning machinery could solve the problem. The answer is that the trouble has never been definitely located. There must be further study. There is no available knowledge upon which to base changes in machinery. There is no experimental equipment at hand. A plant must be constructed. There must be a well-equipped machine shop. At first blush, it might be thought that the equipment could be constructed in machine shops that are already available. I repeat, nobody knows what is needed. There must be trial and there must be corrections. There must be changes. As Pascal, the philosopher, has said, the individual or the mechanic must shut himself up in his shop and work, as he invents and discovers. There must be experiments. It is a matter of common knowledge that inventions are not made by the great manufacturing plants but are the result of the dreams and experiments of some individual.

#### STANDARDS

The Bureau of Standards illustrates the point. The great value of this bureau is that it experiments and invents. The aim is to reduce economic loss. The results are for the public.



As I have said, the Bureau of Standards will cooperate with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the solution of this difficult question. When the machinery has been invented, adjusted, or perfected it will be built by the gin manufacturers. There are mechanical cotton pickers on the market to-day. They have not been produced by the great commercial plants of the country. They have been promoted by the individuals in their shops, where changes could be made promptly, where ideas could be evolved, and where developments could be utilized.

The Delta Experiment Station, located at Stoneville, Miss., is probably the best equipped agricultural experiment station in the South. It is the pride of the Mississippi Delta. Mr. W. E. Ayres is the capable and efficient director of the Delta Station and for some years has studied the problem of cotton ginning. He has brought the matter to the attention of the Department of Agriculture. He has cooperated with Dr. Arthur W. Palmer, of the cotton division of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Dr. R. W. Webb, cotton technologist, Dr. B. Youngblood, principal economist, Office of Experiment Stations, Washington, D. C., Mr. S. H. McCrory, chief of the division of agricultural engineering, and with Mr. Charles A. Bennett, assistant mechanical engineer of the division of agricultural engineering, in an effort to eliminate the losses resulting from improper ginning. In fact, Mr. Ayres first brought the matter to my attention. It was because of the campaign conducted by him that for some time I have endeavored to impress upon the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and upon Congress the importance of further investigations.

#### LOSSES

In 1929 Mr. Ayres took the matter up with the buyers of Delta cotton, in an effort to ascertain the loss due to improper ginning. The average of 23 estimates by these buyers indicated that an average of \$15 a bale is the loss to the Delta farmer through rough ginning of green or wet cotton, to say nothing at all of the shortening of the staple.

It has been estimated that one-third, or 300,000 bales, of the Delta crop are ginned roughly annually at a loss of about \$4,500,000 to the growers. The losses are also increased by the shortening of the staple. It is estimated that 90 per cent of the Delta crop is being shortened from one thirty-second to one-sixteenth of an inch at the gin. This applies to both public and private gins. It is estimated that the cotton growers of the South lose annually fifty millions of dollars because of improper ginning.

Emphasis is being placed upon purebred cotton and better methods of cultivation. Longer staples are being advocated. There must be improvement in American cotton. We have increased our production. We must increase our grade and staple. Rayon is fast becoming a competitor of cotton. There is just as much difference between the rayon of to-day and the rayon of 25 years ago as there is between the appearance of the Ford car of to-day and the Ford car of 25 years ago. The quality of rayon is increasing. It is becoming more and more a competitor of cotton every day. The quality of cotton must be improved if the farmer is to keep pace with his competitor.

The spinner is interested in properly ginned cotton. Every speck of seed, every short fiber, and every nep has to be taken out by the cotton-mill machinery before the yarn is acceptable in its highest form. Much yarn is rejected on account of neppy cotton. In the very nature of the case, the spinner can not pay as much for poorly ginned cotton, where his fabric will be defective, as he can for adequately prepared cotton.

While it is true that the producer and the consumer are both interested, it is obvious that the losses, because of inadequate and improper ginning, fall heaviest upon the farmer. It is nothing short of a tragedy, when planting seed is carefully selected, the land properly cultivated, and the cotton carefully picked, that in the final stage of the movement from the field to the factory so much damage should be done at the gin.

The proposed legislation will enable the efficient farmer to help himself. While the damages to long-staple cotton, on account of inadequate ginning, are more pronounced than the injury to short cotton, it is proposed to establish the plant at a location that will be available to both long and short cotton. Personally, I believe that the investigations of the gin machinery will be productive of other beneficial results. Enormous savings would accrue to the cotton grower if the commercial bale took up less space. Proper pressing is important.

#### FIBER RESULTS

The appropriations already made by Congress for studies in cotton ginning have already borne fruit. The results obtained show that every sample of cotton thus far tested is composed of many different lengths. The percentage of different lengths varies in samples of the same staple length and there is wide variation in samples of different staple lengths, which depend upon the variety of cotton, growing conditions, and ginning.

There is marked uniformity of fiber lengths in the hand pulled or separated sample, and there is a decreased uniformity of fiber lengths in the saw-gin sample. The hand method gives the better result.

#### LABORATORY METHODS

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics is utilizing laboratory methods and employs a sorting machine in arraying different lengths and in measuring and in weighing fibers under proper humidity conditions. The fibers removed by hand, by the small roller gin, and by the large commercial gin, are arrayed separately and records of different lengths are made.

#### SPINNING TESTS

I have had occasion, not only to observe the laboratory methods and the fiber studies, but I have visited the cotton division of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and observed the spinning tests that are being conducted to determine the spinning qualities of lint cotton, whose qualities were changed by known conditions of ginning. There has been cooperation with other Federal departments, with the experiment stations, and with the agricultural colleges, as well as with public and private gins, and with the manufacturers of ginning machinery and cleaning equipment, in an effort to improve ginning conditions that will result in better fibers, with more uniform spinning qualities.

There is a place for the engineer and for the fiber scientist in the solution of the question. All of the gin work now being conducted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is being done in cooperation with the division of agricultural engineering in the Bureau of Public Roads.

#### INFORMATION

It is regrettable that there is a lack of scientific data relating to gin machinery and to the organization and operation of gins. There has been much discussion. Some facts have been ascertained but much is yet to be learned. There is a growing demand for information with respect to correct cotton ginning. The public ginner is the servant of the farmer and he is interested to increase the income of the farmer. There are many breaks in the chain of information now available. Little is known about the effects of different mechanical devices for cleaning and ginning on the spinning qualities of the ginned lint. Less is probably known as to the influence of various cleaning and ginning processes on the fibers, staple length, and the moisture content. In the very nature of the case, answers to these and many other questions can only be supplied by systematic and scientific experiments, to be conducted in the proposed experimental gin plant.

#### THE PROBLEM

There is a problem in cotton ginning and both the producer and the consumer are interested in its solution. The cotton grower, the ginner, the gin manufacturer, and the textile operator would be benefited by the proper solution of the problem. It is a national question. The solution will benefit not only the cotton-growing States but the country at large. Many problems present themselves, such as density of the gin roll, speed of the saws, the moisture in raw cotton, saw-tooth projection over breast roll, the manner of sharpening, and the positions of the teeth on the saws, types and adjustment of cleaning equipment, and other related factors.

I can not overemphasize that ginning is almost as important as breeding in cotton production. The results of years of careful selection and improvement in varieties of seed may be nullified at the gin.

The farmer can solve some of the problems while other questions must be settled at the gin. Inadequate machinery is not the only difficulty. The farmer can help. He can contribute to the elimination of rough or gin-cut cotton. The cotton house in the field has almost entirely disappeared. Cotton is picked and emptied into the wagon. The first cotton picked in the morning is wet with dew and is put into the bottom of the wagon. It never has a chance to dry out. There is small wonder that when it reaches the gin that it is gin cut. Cotton mills are complaining bitterly with respect to rough cotton. Loss in spinning value is excessive and rough cotton, as well as neppy cotton, makes very defective yarn. The cotton house gives an opportunity for the green cotton to dry and an opportunity for all cotton to dry before it is carried to the gin. The farmer can help the ginner. It is impossible to gin wet or green cotton well or fast.

I want to be practical and helpful. While experiments are being conducted and machinery being improved, I call attention to the causes that intensify the problem and result in great losses to the farmer:

First. At the beginning of the cotton season cotton is delivered to the gin when it is too green. There is too much haste in converting the crop into cash. It should be dried. Cotton



houses can be used by the farmer, and drying machinery by the ginner. Mr. Charles A. Bennett, assistant mechanical engineer, to whom I have already referred, is an accomplished and practical mechanic and engineer. He has installed several drying equipments in connection with Delta ginneries during the past season. They will be of material benefit, not only in handling the cotton that is first picked but in drying the cotton after inclement weather.

Second. Too much cotton that is either wet from dew or rain is carried to the gin. The farmer can remedy the situation. The cotton house can be used to advantage, but the probability is that it will be more economical for drying equipments to be installed in cotton gins. I am watching the experiments in cotton drying being conducted by Mr. Bennett with a great deal of interest. There is a field for improvement in all cotton by drying. It will benefit not only the green and sappy cotton but the wet and damp cotton. During the season of 1929 two bales of early green cotton in the Mississippi Delta from the same field were carried to the gin. The first bale was dried in about 30 minutes and at a cost of about a dollar in the cotton drier. The second bale was ginned without drying and sold for 3 cents less per pound than the first bale.

Third. Gins are running too fast. There is too much capacity even with dry cotton. A ginnery is turning out 50 bales when it should be turning out only 30 bales a day. Efficiency is being sacrificed to speed. The farmer is losing. It is not necessarily too much saw speed, but a tight roll and high speed means injury to the staple. Dry cotton is being ginned too fast.

Fourth. The fuzz or seed coat is being cut from the seed. Neps result and there is much loss to the grower. These neps are not the cotton fibers, but they are formed from the fuzz that should remain on the seed. Spinners can pay more for cotton without the fuzz. The oil mill can pay more for the seed with the fuzz on it, as it makes better linters. The grade of the bale is frequently injured by the desire of the ginner to increase the turnout.

Fifth. The matter of cleaning cotton is a no less important or delicate process than the matter of ginning cotton. If the machinery is not properly constructed, the operation of cleaning may very materially affect the spinning qualities of the ginned lint. It is always better to pick cotton by hand, if possible. Machine picking means a poorer grade. Leaves, stems, burs, and foreign matter materially reduce the grade. Rainy weather conditions, of course, account for deteriorations. Snapping and sledding increase the problems of cotton ginning. In many cases if hand-picked cotton is run through cleaners, injury results, for the fibers are damaged. The spinning qualities are reduced in an effort to improve the grade.

#### CONCLUSION

Much progress has been made in the preliminary gin studies, but further progress is hampered by the necessity of using commercial-type gins, which do not afford the range of conditions, the flexibility of adjustment, or the humidity control needed in scientific work.

Further experiments are necessary and additional facilities and equipment especially designed to permit the easy variation and control of the large number of conditions are important.

An experimental gin plant and equipment, with air-conditioning apparatus and uniform humidity, would clear up many questions about which there is now much discussion and result in improvement in the quality of ginning. The proposed legislation will provide for an experimental gin plant, equipped with adequate temperature and humidity control, and with all types of commercial and experimental ginning and cleaning equipments. The needed facilities for an effective attack upon the problem of cotton ginning will be provided. Better cotton ginning will result, and there will follow a general improvement in the cotton crop that will increase the income of the cotton grower by reducing the losses now sustained by reason of inadequate and insufficient ginning.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM EXPOSITION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution 244, authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held October 4 to October 11, 1930, inclusive.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who is going to pay the expense of this conference?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. The oil industry has always paid the expense of it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is certain that we will not have this situation occur again: Several years ago we passed a resolution recognizing an exposition in Philadelphia and were told that the Government would not be called upon to pay any of the expense. Later on we found that the people who urged the passage of the original resolution were pressing very hard for an appropriation running into millions of dollars, and the Government did appropriate millions of dollars over the protest of some of us. I want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma whether in the future there is any possibility that the Congress will be called upon to make an appropriation to take part in the conference and then be told at that time that it is a moral obligation because Congress recognized the conference when we passed this House Joint Resolution No. 244.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. I believe nothing could be more easily answered than the gentleman's question. This exposition has been conducted on a number of occasions and similar resolutions have been passed. We pay our way down there. We are not like some of these older States.

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, the thought that the gentleman from Wisconsin expressed has also been in my mind. I have here an amendment which I am ready to offer, the same as I offered to a resolution some time ago for the Chicago Exposition, to the effect that "the Government of the United States is not by this resolution obligated to any expense in connection with the holding of the exposition and will not hereafter be so obligated except for suitable representation thereat."

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the independent oil producers take part in this conference, or will the conference be confined to the Standard, the Dutch Shell, and the Sinclair oil monopoly, which was very happy indeed when the members of another body rejected a protective tariff on oil which the independent oil producers were demanding?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. The exposition is open to everyone and is participated in by everyone. It is world-wide, and every phase of the industry is shown. It is an educational matter.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The only purpose of this resolution is to give it a national status, so that the State Department may issue invitations to other countries to attend.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. That is all that is involved—asking other governments to come here and participate in the exposition.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the strong argument of the proponent of the resolution, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. O'CONNOR], who is one of the most able, diligent, efficient, and useful Members of the House, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### House Joint Resolution 244

*Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to invite by proclamation, or in such other manner as he may deem proper, the States of the Union and all foreign countries to participate in the proposed International petroleum exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., from October 4 to October 11, 1930, inclusive, for the purpose of exhibiting samples of fabricated and raw products of all countries used in the petroleum industry and bringing together buyers and sellers for promotion of trade and commerce in such products.*

*SEC. 2. All articles that shall be imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at the international petroleum exposition upon which there shall be a tariff or customs duty shall be admitted free of the payment of duty, customs fees, or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during the exhibition to sell any goods or property imported for and actually on exhibition, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: Provided, That all such articles when sold or withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States shall be subject to the duty, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling and necessary exposure, the duty, if paid, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal for consumption or use, and the penalties prescribed by law shall be enforced against any person guilty of any illegal sale, use, or withdrawal.*

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, after line 24, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 3. That the Government of the United States is not by this resolution obligated to pay any expense in connection with the holding of such exposition, and is not hereafter to be so obligated, other than for suitable representation thereat."

The amendment was agreed to, and the House joint resolution, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the House joint resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

#### BOISE NATIONAL FOREST

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4189) to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and I hope I shall not be obliged to do it—this bill adds 150,000 acres of land to a national forest. Whenever we want to take a little piece of land out of a national forest to add to a national park, the national forest people claim to us that it has got to be paid for, that it has certain value on their books, that certain income is to be received, that the counties will get certain income to be used for roads, and so forth, so that the result is that we have hardly a national park where the boundaries have been straightened out as they ought to be. I will say this, that the present administration of the National Forest Service is much broader minded now than was formerly the case. There will not be as much ground for criticism in this as formerly, I am inclined to hope, under the administration of Major Stuart. But in order to keep the books straight, if they are going to keep books on this proposition, I offer an amendment on page 5, line 23, after the word "act," to insert the following:

*Provided further,* That on the books of the Forestry Service there shall be set up a credit for such lands, to be repaid by transfer of like amount of other national-forest lands, where essential for national-park purposes as may be at any time determined by Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, while I am the author of the bill, I will ask my colleague [Mr. FRENCH] to explain the situation.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I do not see any serious objection to the amendment, though I hope the gentleman from Michigan will not press it upon the pending bill, as there is no national park within the area affected.

Mr. CRAMTON. When there is an occasion where the national park people would like to take a little piece of land out of a national forest, the national forest people are not very quick to come up to the mark. A year ago I think I would have pressed this amendment. But the national forest administration is better now than it was then, and I hope for better things. Therefore, in response to the eloquent appeal of my very good friend from Idaho, I shall not press the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice the justification for taking in all this large acreage is the fact that the public lands are now being used by private interests in grazing, and the consequent injury to the land by the herds impairing the surface.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; and serious erosion is occurring.

Mr. STAFFORD. For some years past I have been acquainted with the large profits made by the range holders using the public domain for their special benefit. Can the gentleman give us an idea as to how much of the public domain is used by these ranch holders with their flocks of sheep herding on the public range?

Mr. FRENCH. The public domain of the United States that is available for public use, unregulated and uncontrolled, is approximately 235,000,000 acres. The land that is referred to in the pending bill is almost an infinitesimally small part of that area. It is my hope that as the result of the study that will be made by the Public Domain Commission, which has been appointed by the President, and for which this House has passed a resolution authorizing appropriation for expenses, a program for adequate control will be worked out touching the surface rights generally. Here I am seeking control of a limited area only embraced within the watershed of the Arrowrock Reservoir.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that these large sheep owners have caused their flocks to graze over the public domain without any opposition.

Mr. FRENCH. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. That condition has been repeatedly called to the attention of Congress, dating back to Roosevelt's time. I will ask the gentleman whether any recent action has been considered by the committee as to the taking over of this large domain by these ranch holders for their personal aggrandizement and to the great injury to the lands; all without the payment of a penny for such use?

Mr. FRENCH. Bills have been introduced from year to year, looking to control—I have a bill pending at this time—but up to the present it has not been possible to obtain the support of the Congress in the enactment of legislation, and therefore it has been necessary sometimes to bring in piecemeal legislation to take care of critical situations such as this.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know of any bill ever reported to any body of Congress that sought to regulate the use of the public domain by the millionaire ranch holders of the West.

Mr. FRENCH. My bill has not been reported. I do not know whether or not the bill of the gentleman from Utah has ever received the approval of his committee. But sentiment has been developing looking to the correction of the situation. I am glad to say that in many of the range States that sentiment is growing. Personally, I have long felt that it is imperative that corrective legislation of general character should be enacted. Unfortunately all States of the West have not been in accord upon this subject.

Mr. LEAVITT. This land has been used in the past in such a way without regulation, but under this bill it will come within the area of the national forest.

Mr. STAFFORD. The purpose of this bill is to restrict this land which has heretofore been used by the large owners of the range herds as they have been doing for the past quarter century?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes. We passed in this House not long ago, and later there was passed in the Senate, a bill making an authorization to cover the expenses of this commission to look into the entire subject of these public lands belonging to the Nation.

The gentleman will recall that the Members from the West, from the public-land States, were largely those who led the fight on the floor of the House for the enactment of that legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is problematical, in my mind, why, with this strong cooperative sympathy on the part of the Representatives from the West, some legislation has not in all of these years been brought out on the floor of the House.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield gladly to the gentleman who controls the policy of the Public Lands Committee.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman will recall that for five or six years there has been such legislation pending before the Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman means in committee, not in the House.

Mr. COLTON. Yes; in the committee. Heretofore it has been almost impossible to get anything like a united sentiment among the Members from the West. But that condition is disappearing and the very men to whom the gentleman is referring, who have used these lands in the past, recognize that we are ruining the lands by overgrazing, and they are asking for action. I am glad that the gentleman himself is interested. I want to bring out this legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been interested in this for the last 25 years, and I know the robber barons of the West who have been appropriating these lands for their own selfish ends have throttled all regulatory legislation in the committees, so that it never saw the light of day on the floors of Congress.

Mr. COLTON. It has been difficult to arouse any public sentiment on this matter. I have delivered several speeches and the membership of the House have seemed indifferent to the entire proposition. I am glad that interest is being awakened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection, but approve the purpose of this bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the following-described lands are hereby added to the Boise National Forest, Idaho, and made subject to all laws applicable to national forests:

Sections 2 to 11, inclusive; sections 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, and 26, township 2 south, range 9 east, Boise meridian.



Sections 2, 3, 10, 11, and 12, township 1 south, range 7 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive; north half northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter and lots 1, 4, and 5, section 6; sections 7 to 26, inclusive; and sections 35 and 36, township 1 south, range 8 east, Boise meridian.

All of township 1 south, range 9 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 32, inclusive, township 1 south, range 10 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 3, 4, 5, and 6, township 1 south, range 11 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, east half sections 6 and 7; sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, east half section 18; sections 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 34, 35, and 36, township 1 north, range 6 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1, 2, 3, 7; east half east half northwest quarter and lots 1, 2, 5, and 6, section 10; sections 11, 12, 13, 14, northeast quarter northeast quarter and lots 1, 4, 5, and 6, section 15; sections 18, 19, 20, northeast quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter and lots 1, 4, 5, and 9, section 23; north half and lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 24; and sections 29 to 33, inclusive, township 1 north, range 7 east, Boise meridian.

North half section 5; sections 6 and 7; sections 13 to 18, inclusive; all of section 19 excepting lot 4; sections 20 to 29, inclusive; north half northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter and lots 1, 5, 6, and 11, section 30; east half southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter and lots 1, 6, 7, and 10, section 31; and sections 32 to 36, inclusive, township 1 north, range 8 east, Boise meridian.

Section 1; sections 11 to 36, inclusive, township 1 north, range 9 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; sections 16 to 36, inclusive, township 1 north, range 10 east, Boise meridian.

South half township 1 north, range 11 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, and sections 17, 18, 19, 20, 29, and 30, township 1 north, range 12 east, Boise meridian.

Section 1; east half sections 2 and 11; sections 12 and 13; and east half section 14, township 2 north, range 4 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 1 to 28, inclusive; east half section 29; and section 36, township 2 north, range 5 east, Boise meridian.

Section 1; northeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter and lots 3, 4, 6, 7, and 10, section 2; sections 5 to 9, inclusive; lot 1, section 11; east half, northeast quarter northwest quarter and lots 2, 4, 7, and 10, section 12; east half and lots 2, 5, 8, and 11, section 13; sections 16 to 21, inclusive; northwest quarter northeast quarter and lots 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11; section 24; lots 1 and 4, section 25; and sections 27 to 35, inclusive, township 2 north, range 6 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 3 to 28, inclusive; north half, north half southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter and lots 1, 2, 3, section 29; north half and lots 3, 4, 5, and 6, section 30; lots 1 and 2, section 32; north half north half and lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, section 33; and sections 34, 35, and 36, township 2 north, range 7 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 7, 16, 18, 19, 21; southwest quarter section 22; west half section 27; sections 28, 29, 30, 31, 32; north half section 33; and northwest quarter section 34, township 2 north, range 8 east, Boise meridian.

South half section 25; and section 36, township 2 north, range 9 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 4, 5, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21; and sections 28 to 33, inclusive, township 2 north, range 10 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 31 to 36, inclusive, township 2 north, range 12 east, Boise meridian.

East half and southwest quarter section 14; east half section 23; sections 24 and 25; east half sections 26 and 35; and section 36, township 3 north, range 4 east, Boise meridian.

All of township 3 north, range 5 east, Boise meridian.

Section 6 and south half of township 3 north, range 6 east, Boise meridian.

North half section 30 and south half section 32, township 3 north, range 7 east, Boise meridian.

South half section 1; sections 2, 3, 10; north half sections 11 and 12; sections 15, 16, 21, 22, 27, 28, 33, and 34, township 3 north, range 10 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 4 and 5; south half section 6; and north half section 7, township 3 north, range 11 east, Boise meridian.

Southwest quarter section 19; west half sections 30 and 31; northeast quarter south half section 32; and sections 33 and 36, township 4 north, range 5 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 13, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31, township 4 north, range 6 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 7, 8, and 18, township 4 north, range 7 east, Boise meridian.

Sections 4, 8, 9, 15, 16, 21, 27, 28, and 34, township 4 north, range 10 east, Boise meridian; not heretofore included within the Boise National Forest, Idaho, all ranges east Boise meridian: *Provided*, That the inclusion of these lands in the Boise National Forest shall not

affect adversely any valid entry or settlement claim existing prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOUSE RIVER, N. DAK.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10017) to provide for a survey of the Mouse River, N. Dak., with a view to the prevention and control of its floods.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are two or three bills of like character on the Consent Calendar. I would like to know what the procedure may be for these surveys for flood relief. We passed a general law in 1927, but it was not a very good law. Some of the gentlemen, anxious to get the bill passed, would not cooperate to make it a good law. But that is a thing of the past. Is the system going to be to bring in one stream at a time for survey, and then when you get your survey, costing \$14,000 or \$15,000, propose a project costing several million dollars? How are we to consider this great flood-relief problem intelligently or comprehensively?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has asked the very questions that I had in mind. I am not against the bill, but I want to know what policy the Flood Control Committee is going to establish in matters of this kind. The act of 1927 enumerated some 200 rivers providing for flood control, irrigation, power investigation, and for navigation. I understand the Board of Engineers of the War Department is making these surveys, and I judge from this report that it has made a preliminary survey and examination and has reached the conclusion that this is a local project. If the Committee on Flood Control is going to sponsor legislation like this, I want to know it, because I am in the same position as the gentleman from North Dakota. I have a project that came within that group of rivers that was surveyed, and it is local in its nature, and I would like to know if they are going to take up bills like this.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I will say to the gentleman from New York and also to the gentleman from Georgia that this particular river was not contained in the general legislation. It does not belong properly to any of the river systems of the country which were taken in, in a general way, by the flood control bill.

It is a stream which rises in Canada and comes down into the United States for about 150 miles and then runs back into Canada. Consequently, it was not properly before the Army engineers, or at least the Army engineers so considered, as a river to be in the general legislation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What are the rights of Canada now, if you are going to divert its flow?

Mr. SINCLAIR. We are not going to divert its flow, but we are going to try to take care of the property that it destroys in this country, and ascertain if some means can not be devised by the Army engineers to take care of property that is being destroyed on this side of the line.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The justification for this bill is based upon the fact that this river was not included in the act of 1927 that embraced a great many rivers throughout the country?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is no policy to take rivers enumerated in the act of 1927, on which adverse reports have been reached, and ask for a survey?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Not at all. Those are being taken care of as the Army engineers reach them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was my great pleasure in the campaign of 1896 in speaking for the sound-money cause and gold monometalism—

Mr. SINCLAIR. 1896? The gentleman is going back a long way.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am antediluvian in my service with the Republican Party—to visit Minot and spend a delightful weekend at the home of a State senator whose home bordered on the stream under consideration, the Mouse. It is a small, peaceful flowing river that gave no evidence of ever reaching any flood proportion. If I thought this survey was going to be the basis of national appropriation for some local purpose, I would feel compelled to object. The district engineer says it is local in its

character. The division engineer, however, says that the survey should be undertaken by the National Government. A survey is one thing. The conditions that apply on the Milwaukee River, navigable in character, but not international, are much more dangerous with respect to floods than this little stream, the Mouse. Is it the purpose of the gentleman from North Dakota to follow this up by having the United States Government build some construction works to protect Minot because once in every 8 or 10 years the stream reaches a flood stage as it comes down from Saskatchewan?

Mr. SINCLAIR. In answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin I will say what future action I will take will depend on what the survey discloses. The facts of the matter are that there are no persons or individuals or groups of engineers that we can properly approach to do this work other than the United States Army Engineers.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what impressed me when I was reading the report, that the little city of Minot, of some 15,000 people—

Mr. SINCLAIR. Oh, 18,000 or 20,000, and one of the leading commercial centers of the Northwest.

Mr. STAFFORD. Or 50,000, did not have the facilities to make this investigation and called upon the Corps of Engineers of the National Government for a survey, and for that reason, I did not intend to interpose objection.

Mr. BURTNESS. In view of the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin went out to the Mouse River back in 1896 in the interest of the Republican Party—

Mr. STAFFORD. Not only in the interest of the Republican Party but in favor of gold monometalism and against the Bryan crusade for free silver.

Mr. BURTNESS. I think it might be appropriate to call attention to the fact that this river is located in that part of the country where the rivers run north and the Irish vote the Republican ticket.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I know the gentleman wants to be fair with the House. You can not control floods with a blue print and all you will get out of this survey will be a blue print. If your community can not afford to make a survey and you want the Federal Government to do it, is it not reasonable to expect that you will come back to the Federal Government and ask them to regulate your floods and carry on at the expense of the Government such construction as may be necessary?

Mr. SINCLAIR. We certainly would not expect the Government to contribute to the construction of works any more than their proper share. I think there is a duty that the Federal Government owes in handling this particular stream. It is an international stream and we do not know how far we can go in preparing works, and yet that city is being destroyed. Over \$1,000,000 worth of property in that city was destroyed two years ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of the Mouse River, N. Dak., with a view to preparing plans and estimates for the cost of such work as may be necessary for the prevention and control of its floods, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917, and the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, contained in House Document No. 282, Seventy-first Congress, second session, and the sum of \$15,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE CUMBERLAND RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10213) granting the consent of Congress to rebuild and reconstruct and to maintain and operate the existing railroad bridge across the Cumberland River, near the town of Burnside, in the State of Kentucky.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 3618, identical with the House bill, and which, I understand, is on the Speaker's desk, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to substitute Senate bill 3618 for the bill called up. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway Co., lessee of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, and to its successors and assigns, to rebuild, reconstruct, maintain, and operate its existing railroad bridge and the approaches thereto across the Cumberland River in the county of Pulaski, in the State of Kentucky, near the town of Burnside, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

House bill 10213 was laid on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10248) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Moundsville, W. Va.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River, at or near Moundsville, W. Va., authorized to be built by the Moundsville Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, by an act of Congress approved March 1, 1929, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from March 1, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10258) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice and that it retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice and retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice on page 2 of the committee report there is incorporated a letter from the secretary of the Hawesville & Cannelton Bridge Co., and that in the letter there is a name left blank. Is my information correct that the name which is deleted is the name of the notorious bridge racketeer and speculator, Mr. Elliott?

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Speaker, it is surmised by some that Mr. Elliott is referred to. I have letters from the bridge company stating most emphatically that Mr. Elliott is in no way associated with them in preparing the plans and promoting the work of building this bridge, and that the money so far expended has been raised by the citizens of the community of Cannelton. Further than that I have received a letter from them stating that Mr. Elliott will not be associated with them.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. But he has been associated with them and has, no doubt, already received his handsome profits out of the bridge, has he not?

Mr. DUNBAR. No. Where does the gentleman get such information?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. It was at my request that the gentleman from Indiana, the author of this bill, asked that it go over without prejudice. Mr. Elliott made a statement



before the State's attorney of Maryland while on the stand there in a fraud order case that he owned this franchise. I found, in the case of a bill introduced by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUTLER], that Elliott was in on the bridge in Oregon but they got rid of him. The gentleman from Indiana said the same thing, but I suggested to him that he follow the procedure that the gentleman from Oregon followed and secure affidavits from the people who are promoting the bridge showing that Elliott no longer has any connection with the bridge.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Those affidavits should also show the amount of money he received from the proposition up to the time he left their service.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. That will be up to the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana that this bill go over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE SAVANNAH RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10291) authorizing the State Highway Board of Georgia, in cooperation with the State Highway Department of South Carolina, the city of Augusta, and Richmond County, Ga., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Savannah River at or near Fifth Street, Augusta, Ga.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute in lieu of the House bill an identical Senate bill (S. 3715), which is now on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to consider the bill S. 3715 in lieu of the bill called up. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the State Highway Board of Georgia, in cooperation with the State Highway Department of South Carolina, the city of Augusta, and Richmond County, Ga., be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Savannah River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Fifth Street, Augusta, Ga., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the State Highway Board of Georgia, the State Highway Department of South Carolina, the city of Augusta, and Richmond County, Ga., all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE WHITE RIVER IN ARKANSAS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10340) granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Calico Rock, Ark.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the White River, at a point suitable to the interest of navigation, at or near Calico Rock, Ark., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE COOSA RIVER IN ALABAMA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10461) authorizing Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Coosa River at or near Gilberts Ferry, about 8 miles southwest of Gadsden, in Etowah County, Ala.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object, for the present.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I would like to know the gentleman's reason for objecting.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is a private bridge.

Mr. ALLGOOD. The bridge is to be taken over by the county.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. When?

Mr. ALLGOOD. Immediately upon its construction.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Did the letter which the gentleman showed me refer to this bridge?

Mr. ALLGOOD. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We are to understand, then, that notwithstanding the provisions of the bill, arrangements have been made that on the completion of the bridge it is to be taken over by the county, and you are going through this process by reason of your local laws?

Mr. ALLGOOD. That is it exactly.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be and is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Coosa River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Gilberts Ferry, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Alabama, any political subdivision thereof within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or by condemnation or expropriation, in accordance with the laws of such State governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of 10 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion cost, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interests in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 3. If such bridge shall at any time be taken over or acquired by the State of Alabama, or by any municipality or other political subdivision or public agency thereof, under the provisions of section 2 of this act, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 10 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and the operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 4. The said Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall within 90 days after the completion of such bridge, file with the Secretary of War and with the Highway Department of the State of Alabama a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and at the request of the Highway Department of the State of Alabama shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable cost of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge; for the purpose of such investigation the said Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall make available all of the records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 2 of this act, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 5. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "Ferry," insert "about 8 miles southwest of Gadsden, in Etowah County, Ala."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS WHITE RIVER IN ARKANSAS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10474) granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Sylamore, Ark.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the White River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Sylamore, Ark., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BRIDGES IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10526) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges in the State of Tennessee.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Speaker, a similar bill to this has been passed by the Senate, and yesterday it was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill and that the Senate bill be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* (a) That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by an act of Congress approved June 20, 1929, to be built across the Cumberland River on the projected Gallatin-Martha Road, between Sumner and Wilson Counties, in the State of Tennessee, by the highway department of the State of Tennessee, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from June 20, 1930.

(b) That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved June 20, 1929, to be built across the Cumberland River between Gainesboro and Granville, in the county of Jackson, in the State of Tennessee, by the highway department of the State of Tennessee, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from June 20, 1930.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER AT WELLSBURG, W. VA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10651) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, what has been the delay in this matter?

Mr. MORGAN. There was some preliminary work done in connection with surveys and construction of abutments. The franchise has been purchased by the Mount Vernon Bridge Co.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman says that preliminary work has been done?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I withdraw the reservation.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va., authorized to be built by an act approved May 14, 1928, and extended March 2, 1929, are hereby extended one year and three years, respectively, from May 14, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, after the word "built" insert the following: "by the J. K. Mahone Bridge Co., its successors and assigns,"; after the word "act" add "of Congress."

Line 6, strike out the words "and extended" and insert in lieu thereof "heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved."

Line 7, after the word "hereby" insert the word "further."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DAM ACROSS ROBINS COVE, CHESTER RIVER, MD.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3135) granting the consent of Congress to Helena S. Raskob to construct a dam across Robins Cove, a tributary of Chester River, Queen Annes County, Md.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have the author of the bill tell us something about it. The committee report is very meager. There is not one substantial fact stated in the report.

Mr. BURTNESS. This is only a very minor proposition. It is no power proposition.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. We do not know just what it is.

Mr. BURTNESS. I was on the subcommittee, but I can not recall all of the details of these numerous bills. This is a dam across some little narrow cove of the river and is a simple matter for the convenience of the local people.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the fact that the report does not contain any material facts to show why it should be passed, and we can not obtain the facts on the floor of the House, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### BRIDGES ACROSS THE CUMBERLAND RIVER AT OR NEAR SMITHLAND, KY.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3745) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smithland, Ky.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smithland, Ky., authorized to be built by the State Highway Commission, Commonwealth of Kentucky, by the act of Congress approved May 18, 1928, and heretofore extended by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1929, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from May 18, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TENNESSEE RIVER AT MOUTH OF CLARKS RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 3747) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River authorized to be built by the State Highway Commission, Commonwealth of Kentucky, by the act of Congress approved May 18, 1928, and heretofore extended by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1929, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from May 18, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADDRESS OF HON. GORDON BROWNING

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including therein a very eloquent address delivered by my colleague, Hon. GORDON BROWNING, on the evening of April 10, 1930, at Johnstown, Pa., to the State convention of Women's Federated Democratic Clubs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The address was as follows:

ADDRESS BEFORE THE STATE CONVENTION OF WOMEN'S FEDERATED DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF PENNSYLVANIA

Madam Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the significance of an important era is pictured most perfectly in the biographies of the great contemporaneous characters who shaped it. If you would know the magic of a great cause, that in it which fastens onto and holds the affections of people, study the ideals of its leaders. No different has been the political development of our Nation; and although we had Washington and Franklin and Madison and Henry, each indispensable in our battle for freedom and the launching of our ship of State, it remained for two other characters of that day to fashion and mold the rival political philosophies that have stood at Armageddon from Yorktown to this good hour. I refer, of course, to Hamilton and Jefferson. And their fundamentals of government, with application to our Government in action, are beckoning to us to-day at the crossroads.

Hamilton, though born in obscurity, was one of the most dominating intellects of all time, and at heart was wedded to the idols of class rule as against diffusion of governmental powers among the people. Aneant this view he offered a sketch of government to the Constitutional Convention on June 18, 1787, which embodied his imperialistic ideas. It provided for a Congress with power to pass all laws whatsoever, subject to absolute veto power in the President, who was to be elected for life or during good behavior. The Senate, elected for life, was to have the sole power of declaring war. The governors of all States were to be appointed for life by the General Government, with absolute power of veto over any act of their State legislature, and every law of a State contrary to a law or the Constitution of the United States was declared void.

No one was eligible to vote for election of the President or the Senate unless he owned a certain amount of property. No skeptical medieval despot could have been more distrustful of the rule of the people than the author of this plan. But when he was defeated and our Constitution was submitted, providing for rule by the people, with a central government of a few delegated powers and all else reserved to the States or to the people, his efforts for its ratification were tremendous and decisive. His partisan biographers concede that the basis of Hamilton's scheme for the success of the Government was to

bring property and wealthy classes to its support with mercenary ties by assuring them an immediate and personal pecuniary profit from its operation. He had failed to write class rule and property domination into the body of governmental structure, but he sought to accomplish the same ends by administration of government. Thus, special privilege and centralization were the cardinal principles of this patron saint of the Republican Party, and to those principles that party to-day adheres in both theory and action.

The system of government adopted was the antithesis of Hamilton fundamentals. It ordained rule by the people, and reserved to them all powers and liberties not expressly surrendered through the Constitution to the common necessity. The old order insisted that the people were incapable of intelligent exercise of these powers, and must be governed by overlordism. In answer to this, Jefferson laid bare their fallacy when he said:

"Sometimes it is said that man can not be trusted to govern himself. Can he then be trusted with the government of others?"

Jefferson, born to the purple, with every encouragement of environment and training to lean toward aristocracy, became the greatest apostle of the common man's vested rights, his ability to govern himself, his right to protection against monopoly, the placing of human rights above property rights; in short, the exponent of true Americanism.

Standing on these fundamentals, the Democratic Party, marshaled by Jefferson, began the struggle for the people against organized and privilege-seeking greed, which struggle has continued unabated to now. Those of his convictions had written the Constitution, and he laid down the policy in administration of holding wide open the door of opportunity to all classes of people; of stimulating growth and self-reliance by placing on the people themselves the obligation and necessity to govern.

The statement that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," was never more conclusively proven than in the experience of our people. When the people periodically wrest their heritage from the invisible usurpers it is a habit in them to then relax in a false sense of security. That is when selfish interests intrigue and scheme to recapture control. Andrew Jackson found this process at work when he came to power on a wave of popular uprising against class rule. The Bank of Nicholas Biddle was the embodiment and directing force of this sinister control over Government. Jackson did not temporize with it, or quibble over a course of action. He saw an octopus holding in its embrace the machinery of Government. He destroyed it and gave a rebirth to popular rule. He was the sword of Jeffersonian Democracy, dauntless in courage, lofty in patriotism, and unbending in will. Because of his example and accomplishments we may to-day take courage in the impending struggle to restore once more their Government to the people.

Hamilton's theories have come down to us through the vehicles of the Federalist, the Whig, and the Republican Parties. Under the rule of the latter for more than 50 years they have had their fullest fruition in corruption as the inevitable consequence of favoritism in government. Throughout its history at only two brief intervals, under Lincoln and Roosevelt, has the Republican Party tried to appear at ease in the stolen garb of Democracy; but it has never been able to conquer its yearning for the old regalia of stripes worn by it so much more becomingly. Lincoln no more belonged to that system than did Jefferson fit in with the Federalistic theories. And had Lincoln lived he would have been the target for the same cruel shafts that struck the armor of old stout-hearted Andrew Johnson. When the assassin's bullet found its mark, Thad Stevens and his ilk were brewing the hemlock which they hoped to press to the lips of the great liberator. But upon his demise those who hated him, yet were controlled by a stronger passion, that of an "immediate and personal pecuniary interest" in the favors of government, were quick to reckon the value of his martyrdom for a moral cause and the force of the sectional hatred they could build around it. So they tacked his banner to their masthead and sailed forth to plunder the gullible and the helpless. Ever since then their war emblem has been the "Bloody Shirt," but their war aim has been booty. Since 1861 their leaders have sought, and largely succeeded in linking the Democratic Party and secession and bloody Civil War together as a screen to conceal their real purpose of getting, through administration of government, that which they have no legal or moral right to, namely, favors at the expense of merely ordinary citizens. It was uncovered in the multitudinous scandals under Grant, Harding, and others, the theft of a Presidency from Tilden, the free rein to plunder given the favored throughout their party's history.

But, to establish this charge we do not have to revert to ancient political history. We do not even have to rely on the recent chapter of thievery under the "Harding gang," that mantled the face of America with the blush of shame. They only grew a little crude and careless. Their code was the time-honored one promulgated by the national Republican organization years before this debacle, and the one yet in force. That is why not a single leader of the Harding, Coolidge, or Hoover administrations has condemned the thieves or the thieveries. To them the offense was not in the crimes against the people; it rested solely in their having been caught.

The trend toward centralized power in Washington under the Republican rule has gone on apace, till now we have 600,000 Federal employees, with less than 600 of them elected by the people. The others

are removed two or three times from responsibility to anyone who votes. They are reckless in disregard of liberty since they have no responsibility for it, they undertake to supervise personal conduct, and think they should order the life of each citizen from the cradle to the grave. This results from the necessity that Congress has when it assumes jurisdiction of every phase of regulation which should be left to the States and to the communities to delegate the administration of its laws to bureaus whose agents swarm over the land to plague and consume.

Sad and gloomy is our path if our people are to be driven to surveillance, robbed of initiative and responsibility. The genius of our peculiar society lies in the necessity of the people to govern. Without it no leadership can develop, no progress will cheer us. Our hope is in self-reliance, not in paternalism. Our political structure was built on the liberty and responsibility of the citizen, not for his regulation.

I maintain that the manipulations of the Treasury Department under Mr. Mellon have been such as to arouse the justified suspicion of deceptive design and rank favoritism. But they are so typical of Republican administration! When he wanted to defeat the adjusted-compensation measure he willfully made an error of \$1,000,000,000 in the estimate of the Treasury receipts for one year. This was the first time a Secretary of the Treasury ever missed a yearly estimate of receipts more than \$25,000,000. That is only one of the many instances of deceptive design. As to rank favoritism, under his administration, and up to last year, \$2,800,000,000 had been given back in taxes to the large favored corporations in the form of refunds and abatements of moneys collected on their own returns under the Wilson administration. Some of the fabulous sums now being paid back in this way are for collections beyond the year 1917. A large part of the most recent "charities" of this nature went to Pennsylvania corporations. In July, 1928, Mr. Andrew Mellon sat as Secretary of the Treasury on one side of the table with Mr. Andrew Mellon of the Aluminum Trust on the other side, agreed to and did refund \$1,287,426 in back taxes to the Aluminum Co. with the sole comment, "It was an inventory adjustment." Since 1925 the United States Steel Corporation has received approximately \$100,000,000 in this manner.

In 1919, through an error, I was forced to pay \$4.50 income tax on my 1917 Army salary, which was exempt. When I inquired of that I am politely advised that the statute of limitations has long since run against its refund. But corporations have no trouble reopening their claims for millions back to that year. They seem to know the combination. It is presumptuous for a mere citizen to expect any such consideration or attention.

I have no doubt many of these cases are reopened on invitation or suggestion. Big business owns this Government under Republican rule. Mellon treats with arrogant contempt the clamor of the Democratic leaders for him to show the public a record of these surreptitious "settlements." He cares not what you think of his ethics in dealing with himself and friends; his logic is that they bought a controlling interest in the Government through campaign contributions, therefore should be allowed to partition as spoils that which they own. That is Republican rule.

Mergers, consolidations, combines are forming to such an extent that monopoly is becoming our national policy. The Sherman antitrust law and other measures designed to curb monopoly are being looked upon as relics of an age when we had some regard for individual rights and interests as opposed to corporate greed. The Federal Trade Commission and other agencies set up by the Democrats for the protection of the public have been deliberately "stacked" to defeat their original purposes. Big business, as such, may be with us to stay. It will either be master or servant. We must control it, if at all, by forced competition or by regulation. It is imperative that the people have a voice in that control. They will never have it so long as the very interests to be regulated name the commissions and dictate their activities. If the Federal Trade Commission by chance should expose a flagrant violation of the laws and court decrees against monopoly, as it did in the merger of the Aluminum Co. with the Duke interests, some Mellon on the inside administers an opiate to the Attorney General and the travesty is left exposed but unmolested. The case made out against the Aluminum Co. was dismissed on April 4 without comment.

It was stated at a recent bankers' convention, without challenge, that 80 per cent of the capitalization of all the banks in the Nation is now held by 12 financial concerns. These 12 concerns have a working understanding, no doubt, with power to dominate or crush all independent institutions. All industries are traveling the same road, passing at will, and unchallenged, those who are supposed to be the sentinels of our liberties. Greed has a taste of profit and can not listen to the counsels of wisdom. Its motto is "Let things be unrestrained, though the result is the destruction of man."

The forces now driving us to inevitable reform or revolution are blind, for the people will some day rise in righteous wrath and smite them, even if, like Samson, they bring the temple down on their own heads. In my judgment, they are ready to right the wrongs without resort to radical measures. But any worthy cause must have stalwart

leaders. What we need is a Jefferson, a Jackson, or a Wilson. What a pitiful comparison to them would be our last three Presidents! Harding and Coolidge were acceptable to those in control only because they would obey implicitly. The present occupant does not even know how to obey.

If uncertainty of mind and timidity of soul are qualities of leadership, Herbert Hoover is a born leader. Sound legal opinion will hold with the view that an election is a contract between the people and the party chosen President for a term of four years. And without doubt an action could now be sustained in any court of equity in the land to cancel that contract with him on the grounds of failure of consideration on his part. Were I bringing the suit, I would rest my case after filing a certified copy of his official accomplishments.

There is an old common-law writ known as *audita querela* by which even a judgment defendant can be relieved if he shows developments after judgment that would make it unconscionable to enforce it. Undoubtedly it was just such predicaments in which the whole American people find themselves enmeshed to-day that provoked the origin of that rule. A majority of those voting for President Hoover did it in good faith, and I submit that in equity and good conscience even they should not be punished further.

Heralded as a superman with a scientific mind and a definite plan, we inaugurated him with a confession from him and his party that every industry, every activity of the Nation was prosperous and happy except agriculture, which they admitted was languishing under eight years of Republican rule. In addition to the creation of a Farm Board, which has been used only for purposes of persuading the farmers to curtail production, he proposed a limited revision of the tariff in favor of the farmer. It would be as reasonable to contend that one suffering from poison should have a heavy dose of arsenic. But the program was launched, with the result that farm prices have consistently fallen, and a third of our consuming public is thereby financially prostrate. The index price of all staple farm products has fallen 15 points since the creation of the board, with a falling off in production from the last season. The farmer is about to be "relieved" of what little he had left over from the ravages of eight years of Republican prosperity!

No sooner had this "limited revision" begun than the cloven-hoof beats of "Grundism" could be heard rattling on the marble floors of the Republican council chambers. The destitute farmer was used to pry open the door, then was stood up against the wall and shown that he was only to be butchered to make a political holiday for those who own the Government under Republican rule.

The revelries of insatiate greed began, with JOE GRUNDY as master of ceremonies. He warned that those who paid for the election of Hoover had come for a reckoning, and proceeded to dictate the highest program of legalized robbery that ever quickened the dream of avarice. Fifteen Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee sanctioned what GRUNDY told them to write, and a Republican House stultified its honor by doltish compliance, without granting the privilege of amendment. The people were put on notice that their payment of tribute has merely begun. The President was importuned in vain to take a stand against such treachery.

This child of iniquity, designed to serve every interest except the common interest, was escorted to the Senate, where the same arrogant gang of privilege employed the chief lobbyist of the Connecticut Manufacturers' Association and placed him in the executive sessions to nurse it through the committee. It came forth from that committee with many added frills and embellishments, to encounter a coalition formed of the Democrats and those progressive Republicans, who did not feel bound by the Old Guard agreement to permit those who paid the campaign expenses to rob the farmer and the consuming public.

At this point again came a logical demand for the President to make known his position. The Old Guard claimed they represented his views. The Progressives claimed he was with them in standing by his platform. Some of the Democrats made bold to hope he was fair enough to share their views. No term describes the way he faced this great opportunity so well as "groveling." Before they finished the bill in the Senate every faction was denying that they had any connection with the President's views, for if they claimed him defeat was certain, so contemptuous is the general feeling toward him. How the mighty hath fallen! What an auspicious beginning!

"But yesterday the word of Caesar might

Have stood against the world; now lies he there,  
And none so poor to do him reverence."

As usual, the effort to write a tariff bill has degenerated into a snarling brawl over the booty. No Democrat wants to injure legitimate business. The time-honored position of our party has been a tariff to cover the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. That is all any honest business wants; it is all any dishonest business ought to have. To carry out this policy, President Wilson procured the creation of a Tariff Commission to determine scientifically these differences. Had this plan been followed, we would have been spared the spectacle of logrolling and deceit we now behold.

Additional reasons for a Democratic tariff are that infant industries no longer exist; we are an export Nation and need foreign markets; we



need the friendship of other peoples who are now retaliating; we are a creditor Nation, and our debtors can only pay in products; an American laborer can produce five times as much as one of his competitors. America can outstrip the world in mass production, and we need foreign markets for our surplus products and farm crops. The destruction of foreign markets for farm surpluses has destroyed the purchasing power of one-third of our consuming public.

It is proposed to add more than a billion dollars to the tariff burden already on the consuming public. Before this is done the people should be reminded that they now pay a yearly tribute of \$4,000,000,000 to the tariff barons who are demanding this increase. They have placed a toll-gate across the portal of every home in the land and have barred with it the doors to the wardrobe and the pantry. You must pay before you enter. The chief merit to be claimed for the present exorbitant system is that it places more than a half billion dollars revenue in the Treasury each year. But it is a rather extravagant system when it costs you \$8 to get one into the Treasury. The farmer will pay \$10 toll for every dollar made effective on his products in this bill.

If prohibitive tariffs can bring prosperity, may I ask what is wrong now? For 10 years we have been protected by a Chinese wall. No tariff before then ever approached the rates now in force. Twenty billions of dollars were wiped away in the most recent panic. Where is this vaunted prosperity? Distress is prevalent throughout the land, and that with a man in the White House who promised to banish poverty from America! Somewhere between 4,000,000 and 10,000,000 men are idle. They and their families are hungry. They want to work.

In a court recently a man who had applied for naturalization was being examined by the judge when the following colloquy took place:

The COURT. Who is President of the United States?

The APPLICANT. Al Smith.

The COURT. Why do you say Al Smith?

The APPLICANT. Well, I was told that if he was elected we would have hard times, and I certainly thought he was, from the times we are having.

A newspaper item announced not long since that "Sam Lomax broke his back last week trying to shoulder a dollar's worth of Hoover oats."

Hard times under Democratic rule; good times under Republican rule! This ancient lie has been repeated so often that some of the most credulous have been made to believe it. How can anyone fall out of the bed when he is already lying on the floor? With the great engineer Hoover in the White House, with a majority of 104 in the House and 16 majority in the Senate; with prosperity in industry proclaimed throughout the Nation; yet in less than a year millions are clamoring for bread and begging for work. From the housetops the administration leaders are shouting "reds" at them. They can see a Bolshevik in every bush; and if they find a man with corns on his hands they look for a bomb concealed under his ragged coat.

How can a man reason when he is being tortured by the pangs of hunger? These conditions are the direct result of the Dives kind of prosperity given us by Republican rule. The Bourbons, preceding the French Revolution, were content with a rule that brought luxury and ease to the nobility. They were disdainful of the empty pots on the hearthstones of the peasants. The consequences were written in the blood tragedy of fearful years.

The Democratic Party has often been called upon in a crisis, and it has never failed to restore the Government to the people when they became surfeited with misrule and corruption. It was done under Jefferson, it was done under Jackson, it was done under Cleveland, and it was done under Wilson. The task now confronting us is to restore honesty in government; to preserve the liberties of the people; to safeguard equality in all privileges of living; to reestablish the necessity and responsibility of self-government by the people themselves. These are the sacred jewels of our heritage, the golden candlesticks and vessels ensconced in a charter of liberties. Well may we bear that charter aloft as we circle the walls of Jericho. And, like the unholy Jew who steadied the Ark of the Covenant, all who dare to raise a profane hand to pollute it should be stricken to earth.

The Democratic Party is the only one that has survived throughout the life of the Nation because it is the only one founded on the ideals of permanent justice and true Americanism. If we could eliminate the false issues and prejudices so often determinative in a national election, we would never lose a battle, for a great majority of the American people in their hearts are Democrats. But somehow they permit the sirens of sordid materialism or the passions of false moral issues to becloud or beguile their judgment. Just as was done in 1928 when a man's religion and a bogus issue of prohibition elected a President who never had an honest intention of enforcing the prohibition law, if we are to judge by a barren record of more than a year in responsibility.

Candidates are as transient as the passing clouds. But the fundamentals of our party are as permanent as the shrines of freedom, as the love of liberty, or the temporal hope of mankind. We do not have to win as a matter of temporary political expediency, but we do have to be true to those ideals. Let us fight the good fight and keep the faith. I have confidence in the ultimate untrammelled judgment of the American people. They are now conscious of the false prophecies and be-

trays of the unfaithful Republican leaders. The responsibility is soon to be ours. May we meet it with a leadership worthy the ideals we profess.

#### ELECTION TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the following privileged resolution and ask its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 207

*Resolved*, That JOHN M. WOLVERTON, of West Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6564) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SMOOT, Mr. JONES, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. McKELLAR to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 215. An act to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1923, entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services," as amended by the act of May 28, 1928; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS DETROIT RIVER AT GROSSE ISLE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of S. 4027, to legalize a bridge across the American channel of the Detroit River leading from the mainland to Grosse Isle, Mich., and about 16 miles below the city of Detroit, Mich. This has been favorably reported from the committee and is on the calendar. It is a free bridge and is an emergency matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent for the consideration of S. 4027. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the bridge now being reconstructed by the Board of County Road Commissioners of Wayne County, Mich., across the American channel of the Detroit River, leading from the mainland to Grosse Isle, Mich., about 16 miles below the city of Detroit, Mich., if completed in accordance with plans accepted by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, as providing suitable facilities for navigation, shall be a lawful structure, and shall be subject to the conditions and limitations of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and, in accordance with the order heretofore made (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Monday, April 14, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, April 12, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

#### COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

For the relief of Frank J. Boudinot (H. R. 5847).

For Monday, April 14, 1930:

#### COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION—SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOSPITALS

(10 a. m.)

To consider proposals for veterans' hospitals in California and Washington.

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the expenses of participation by the United States in the International Conference on Load Lines, London, England, 1930 (H. J. Res. 297).

## COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended (H. R. 10478).

## COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider private bills.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

404. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination of Salmon River, Alaska, with a view to the control of the floods (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

405. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers on survey of the Escambia River, Ala. and Fla., with a view to the control of the floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

406. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment under the Architect of the Capitol for the fiscal year 1931 (H. Doc. No. 343); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

407. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting five drafts of proposed legislation affecting existing appropriations of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, 1929, and 1930 (H. Doc. No. 344); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

408. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the George Washington Bicentennial Commission for the fiscal year 1931, amounting to \$148,200 (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

409. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1931, amounting to \$50,000 (H. Doc. No. 347); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

410. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the thirteenth annual report of the Federal Farm Loan Board for the year ended December 31, 1929 (H. Doc. No. 212); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers and illustrations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Committee on Invalid Pensions, H. R. 11588. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; without amendment (Rept. No. 1135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 11575) authorizing the construction, maintenance, repair, and preservation of certain public works for the improvement of navigation and the development of power on that section of the St. Lawrence River extending from Lake Ontario to the towns of Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Prescott, Ontario; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CLARK of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 11576) to amend section 6, chapter 389, approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555; U. S. C. title 5, sec. 652), entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 11577) to provide for the establishment of a branch home of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 11578) to restore certain persons to their former rank as officers on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KORELL: A bill (H. R. 11579) to provide for the partial payment of the expenses of foreign delegates to the Eleventh Annual Convention of the Federation Interalliee Des Anciens Combattants, to be held in the District of Columbia in September, 1930; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 11580) to amend section 1709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stats. 1083), and section 304 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stats. 24); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 11581) to improve the efficiency of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11582) to provide monuments to mark the birthplaces of deceased Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 11583) for the acquisition of private lands within the exterior boundaries of the Niobrara Reservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 11584) to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 11585) to authorize the President of the United States to lease Muscle Shoals on certain terms and conditions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. OWEN: A bill (H. R. 11586) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire toll bridges and maintain them as free bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11587) to authorize the acquisition of certain land required by the United States Bureau of Lighthouses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11588) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 11589) to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the present value of their adjusted service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 11590) to amend section 1, act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 11591) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River opposite to or within the corporate limits of Nebraska City, Nebr.," approved June 4, 1872; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11592) providing for the sale of the remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in the segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ESTERLY: Resolution (H. Res. 206) that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization is authorized to conduct an investigation relative to importation of skilled labor under the immigration act, 1917; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 300) to permit the Pennsylvania Gift Fountain Association to erect a fountain in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Library.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, recommending to Congress the passage of House bill 2562, providing for increase in pension for the veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, recommending to Congress the passage of House bill 2526, providing for an increase of pensions for the veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:



By Mr. BAIRD: A bill (H. R. 11593) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 11594) to amend an act for the relief of Augusta Cornog, approved May 29, 1929; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11595) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11596) granting a pension to Charles C. Pruitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 11597) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia E. Oliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 11598) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 11599) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Sigrist; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11600) granting a pension to Lida I. Slevin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11601) for the relief of William J. Dillon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 11602) for the relief of G. T. Fleming; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11603) for the relief of C. J. Holliday; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11604) for the relief of J. B. Trotter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOYLE: A bill (H. R. 11605) for the relief of Frank Bernard Crilly; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 11606) for the relief of Edwin L. Menzer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11607) granting a pension to Lydia Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 11608) for the relief of Jerry Esposito; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 11609) granting an increase of pension to Ann Lowmiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11610) to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Page B. Myler, a former rural carrier out of East Liverpool, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 11611) for the relief of Capt. George R. Armstrong, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 11612) granting a pension to Edwin H. McSloy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 11613) granting an increase of pension to Caroline G. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 11614) granting an increase of pension to Tillie E. Shryock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 11615) granting a pension to William Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 11616) granting a pension to Della Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6716. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the officers and members of the Post Office Square Club, urging the passage of the La Follette-Kendall short Saturday workday bill, S. 2540, as they feel that in granting the worker this additional time for a rest and recreation that his efficiency and productivity are greatly increased; and postal employees who perform arduous service and are subjected to the inclemencies of the weather should have the benefit of at least a shorter workday on Saturday in order to give them an opportunity to rest and return to duty on Monday morning refreshed and able to perform their work in such manner as must produce greater efficiency and productivity; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6717. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Memorial of Common Council of Kenosha, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to proclaim October 11 of each year as Pulaski memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6718. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of many citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., favoring Senate bill 1468, to amend the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, by extending its provisions to tobacco and tobacco products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6719. Also, petition of many citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., favoring increased pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6720. By Mr. DEROUEN: Resolution of the common council of the city of Merryville, La., memorializing the Congress of the United States for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 167, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6721. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition of A. J. Bell and approximately 50 others, indorsing an increased rate of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6722. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of Rhode Island State Nurses Association, urging support of Goodwin bill, House bill 10574; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6723. Also, petition of Martin W. Law, San Francisco, Calif., in support of House bill 7765—Spanish-American War—payment in lieu of transportation in kind; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6724. Also, petition of Railway Mail Association, Oklahoma City, Okla., in support of House bills 6603 and 3087; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6725. Also, petition of George Minchak, Yonkers, N. Y., in support of Kendall bill providing shorter workday on Saturday for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6726. Also, petition of Joseph Gawler's Sons (Inc.), morticians, District of Columbia, urging enactment of legislation to control sale of narcotics by providing for issuance of specific prescription blanks by physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6727. Also, petition of National Association of Retail Grocers, St. Paul, Minn., in support of House bill 11, Capper-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6728. Also, petition of Southwestern Millers' League, Kansas City, Mo., calling attention to importance of retaining amendment No. 1213 on page 476 of the Senate tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6729. Also, petition of Philadelphia Ocean Traffic Bureau, protesting against enactment of legislation granting consent of Congress to construct and maintain a bridge across the Delaware River at Wilmington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6730. By Mr. HICKEY: Resolution of Warsaw Progress Club, Warsaw, Ind., urging the passage of a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6731. Also, resolution of the East Side Mothers Study Club, Warsaw, Ind., urging the passage of a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6732. Also, resolutions of common council of the city of South Bend, Ind., memorializing Congress to enact House bill 9143, for the payment in full of the face value of adjusted-service certificates and memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 167, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6733. By Mr. KELLY: Petition of citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., favoring increased pensions for veterans of Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6734. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition consisting of individual letters, registering protests against the Federal education bill, and contending that education is a local matter, and not for Government administration, from the following citizens of the third congressional district, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Mary Alstead, Agnes Bradshaw, Charles Carney, Ellen Connolly, Alice Dempsey, Mary Dumlevy, Mrs. M. Fannegan, Johanna Fee, Matthew Flynn, Frank A. Gilbride, James Guidera, P. J. Gunning, Jr., Jennie A. Hemian, Mrs. B. Higgins, Thomas P. Higgins, Mary Howard, Mary E. Keilly, John McDade, Mrs. McDonnell, Mary McGowan, E. McMahon, David Moss, Joseph Moss, Mary E. Murphy, Anna O'Connell, Elizabeth Oggari, Catherine Quinlan, Bridget Reynolds, Mrs. Patrick Ryan, William Shelton, Charles Slickler, Mrs. S. Swain, and William E. Trinkleback; to the Committee on Education.

6735. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of 33 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 8976, for the relief of veterans and widows and minor orphan children of veterans of Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

6736. By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: Petition of citizens of Berry's Lick, Ky., urging passage of bill to increase pensions

of men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6737. By Mr. PITTENGER: Petition of Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County, Minn., protesting against proposed merger of Great Northern and Northern Pacific Railway Cos.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6738. By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition of Mrs. John Ulm, of Dubuque, Iowa, and many other citizens in favor of House bill 2562, providing an increased rate of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6739. By Mrs. ROGERS: Petition of John H. Donahue and other members of the National Soldiers' Home at Togus, Me., petitioning Congress for a pension for the veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6740. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition signed by Eugene M. Carter and other residents of Jefferson County, Ky., supporting Spanish War veterans' legislation; to the Committee on Pensions.

6741. By Mr. WALKER: Petition signed by Mrs. L. L. Bryant and Mrs. W. B. Poor, of the Danville Union of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking for Federal supervision of motion pictures requiring higher standards before production which are to be used interstate and internationally; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE

MONDAY, April 14, 1930

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who transcendest all our thoughts of Thee, yet comest to us in the things that are seen, enable us to realize the presence of eternity, that we may wisely employ our time; the nearness of Thy judgment, lest we forget what manner of men we are; the long-suffering of Thy love, lest at thought of Thee we grow afraid. Bring us from our diverse views into the realm of the common truth, from the cares of our self-love to the ardors of self-abnegation, that united to Thee in the fundamental law of duty Thy presence may surround our ignorance, Thy holiness our sin, Thy peace the disquiet of our souls.

Grant this, we beseech Thee, for the sake of Thy Son, who took upon Him our flesh and suffered death upon the cross that all mankind should follow the example of His great humility, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, April 8, 1930, when, on request of Mr. Fess and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hattigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate:

S. 3618. An act granting the consent of Congress to rebuild, reconstruct, maintain, and operate the existing railroad bridge across the Cumberland River near the town of Burnside, in the State of Kentucky;

S. 3715. An act authorizing the State Highway Board of Georgia, in cooperation with the State Highway Department of South Carolina, the city of Augusta, and Richmond County, Ga., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Savannah River at or near Fifth Street, Augusta, Ga.;

S. 3745. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smithland, Ky.;

S. 3747. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River;

S. 3820. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges in the State of Tennessee; and

S. 4027. An act to legalize a bridge across the American Channel of the Detroit River leading from the mainland to Grosse Isle, Mich., about 16 miles below the city of Detroit, Mich.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1186. An act to amend section 5 of the act of June 27, 1906, conferring authority upon the Secretary of the Interior to fix the size of farm units on desert-land entries when included within national reclamation projects;

H. R. 1601. An act to authorize the Department of Agriculture to issue two duplicate checks in favor of Utah State treasurer where the originals have been lost;

H. R. 3246. An act to authorize the sale of the Government property acquired for a post-office site in Akron, Ohio;

H. R. 4189. An act to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest;

H. R. 6343. An act to provide for the extension of the boundary limits of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the establishment of which is authorized by the act approved May 22, 1926 (44 Stats. p. 616);

H. R. 9761. An act to authorize the issuance of patents in fee for Indian homesteads on the Crow Reservation, the Blackfeet Reservation, and the Fort Belknap Reservation, in the State of Montana, upon written application therefor;

H. R. 9895. An act to establish the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9934. An act providing for the sale of timberland in four townships in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 10017. An act to provide for a survey of the Mouse River, N. Dak., with a view to the prevention and control of its floods;

H. R. 10173. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations of cotton ginning;

H. R. 10248. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Moundsville, W. Va.;

H. R. 10340. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Calico Rock, Ark.;

H. R. 10416. An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws;

H. R. 10461. An act authorizing Royce Kershaw, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Coosa River at or near Gilberts Ferry, about 8 miles southwest of Gadsden, in Etowah County, Ala.;

H. R. 10474. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Sylamore, Ark.;

H. R. 10627. An act to amend the act of February 14, 1920, authorizing and directing the collection of fees for work done for the benefit of Indians;

H. R. 10651. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.;

H. R. 10674. An act authorizing the payment of six months' death gratuity to beneficiaries of transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who die while on active duty;

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry," approved February 14, 1920, as amended January 21, 1922, and as extended December 28, 1922;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the use of tribal funds belonging to the Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians in South Dakota to pay expenses and compensation of the members of the tribal business committee for services in connection with their pipestone claim; and

H. J. Res. 244. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held October 4 to October 11, 1930, inclusive.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2719. An act granting the consent of Congress to the superintendent of public works of the State of New York to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River at the southerly extremity of the city of Troy;

S. 3618. An act granting the consent of Congress to rebuild, reconstruct, maintain, and operate the existing railroad bridge across the Cumberland River near the town of Burnside, in the State of Kentucky;

S. 3745. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smithland, Ky.;

S. 3820. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges in the State of Tennessee; and